THE EVANGELISTS AND THE RESURRECTION

RALPH W. HARDEN

3/6 n

Class 232.5 R Book H221

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AJV-350

THE EVANGELISTS AND THE RESURRECTION

THE EVANGELISTS AND THE RESURRECTION

BY

RALPH WILLIAM HARDEN, B.A.

Sometime Vicar of S. John's, Monkstown

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

LONDON

SKEFFINGTON & SON

34 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

Publishers to His Majesty the King

1914

232.5 R
H221

62180

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PREFACE.

For the subject matter of the following pages no apology is needed. The interest which the Resurrection of our Lord, the fundamental article of the faith, must always have for the Christian has been so intensified by recent controversy that any work treating of this great event may easily hope for acceptance. And yet, it may be asked, considering the multitude of books upon this subject that have lately appeared, What possible need can there be for one more? Let me offer my apology in as few words as possible.

The following pages are occupied with the consideration of those events which took place in or near the Lord's sepulchre during the forenoon of the day of His Resurrection. For these events our sole authority is the record furnished by the four Evangelists. Now, reviewing the history of the Resurrection in the light of recent controversy, one cannot fail to be struck by the very superficial manner in which the Gospel narrative has been treated—if treated at all—by almost every one who has written upon the subject. It has come to be thought by many, if one may judge from their writings, that the evidence of S. Paul, as being the earliest documentary, is far the best evidence of the Resurrection; and therefore more deserving of our attention than that still earlier evidence furnished by the Evangelists. There is, therefore, I conclude, room for another book, which may recall the atten-

tion of the Church to the one full and detailed history presented by the Holy Spirit in the narrative of the four Evangelists.

There is, besides, a more imperative call to this study on account of the doubts cast upon the truthfulness of the Gospels by the discussion of what is known as the *Synoptic Problem*. Whatever be the merits of this new treatment of the Gospel records, however great the learning, the ingenuity, or the skill, of those who are engaged in maintaining it, there can be no doubt that the actual result of their toil is to diminish, if not to discredit altogether, the truthfulness and authority of the inspired history. In this volume, therefore, I have endeavoured to raise a protest against a system which, however marvellous its ingenuity or however eminent its supporters, necessarily involves the destruction of the foundation of the faith. I cannot believe that a system which discards the authenticity of the four Gospels, which substitutes the haphazard flotsam and jetsam of tradition in their room, can ever command that unwavering assent which God demands of His children, and which is cheerfully yielded by them to all that is delivered by eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word. Accordingly, in the following study I have accepted throughout, S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John, as the authors of the several Gospels which bear their names, convinced that they were, each and all, competent and credible historians of all that they relate, either as witnessed by themselves, or as faithfully transcribed by them from the lips of those who saw and heard.

This conclusion may or may not be mistaken. I do not, indeed, contend that it is a fact absolutely proven, that the four Evangelists are the authors of the Gospels which bear their names; but I claim the manifest right to hold as most probable what has been from earliest times the unwavering conviction of the Church, until scholars can make it scientifically certain that this authorship is impossible. This, however, is far from being the case. The arguments against the traditional view all proceed from internal evidence and are based upon no ascertained fact: on the contrary, they are at best but doubtful conjectures derived from premisses hypothetic if not improbable; and these, so great is their number and so contradictory their nature, are such that no conclusion has yet been found to command the general assent of the critics.

All, then, that I postulate in this study of the Resurrection is this: That whatever is found related in each Gospel corresponds in every particular to what we know of the person, the character, the circumstances, and the opportunities, of each of the four writers. What we find in one Gospel is marked by the individuality of its writer and cannot be ascribed to any other without serious loss and detriment to this characteristic.

Yet further: Believing, as I do, that the writers of these Gospels were inspired men, writing under the teaching and guidance of the Spirit of God in a sense which can be predicated of no other writers than of the authors of the books which form the Bible, my aim throughout has been to show that not one of them, in his narrative of the death and

burial and resurrection of Christ, can be proved guilty of any confusion, blunder, or error, in the entire of this history. What has been alleged to their discredit under these heads, I have endeavoured, I hope not unsuccessfully, to prove is wholly the error, not of the Scripture, but of those who have attempted to interpret Scripture, and who, not infrequently, have perverted its letter. In thus claiming, for writings of which God Himself is in a unique sense the Author, a higher reverence than modern criticism seems willing to allow, I am thankful to be able to quote here some forcible words of the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Wace), which have appeared since this book was written. In the course of some remarks upon the latest books of Dr. Swete, upon the Holy Spirit in the New Testament and in the Ancient Church, the Dean proceeds :—" It should be clearly recognised, once for all, that those who are resisting the present tendency of criticism, both in the Old and the New Testament, are not maintaining principles of modern origin—of the Evangelical School, for instance, or even of the Reformation—but principles handed down by the Jewish Church to the Christian Church, sanctioned, at least in substance, by our Lord Himself, and by Him, in Dr. Swete's words, 'handed on to His Church as one of the elementary *credenda* of Christianity.' " And, a little further on the Dean adds : " The chief complaint to make of it [current criticism] is that it seems to take no account of the presence and operation of the Spirit of God in the structure and production of the Scriptures, but relies on the conclusions to which some scholars are

led by purely literary considerations, without measuring them in any degree with the faith of our Lord and of the ancient Church." [1]

This book, however, is not a discussion of the Synoptic Problem: it is a study of the inspired history of the death, burial, and resurrection, of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that history only. Whatever commentaries or expositions I have consulted—and they are many—I have not consulted for the purpose of forming or supporting any theory of interpretation, my own or others', but solely in the endeavour to ascertain what is the exact statement of every word and phrase in the Gospel history of the Resurrection. It is to be regretted that so few expositors have thought it worth their while to compare and weigh the language of the four Evangelists in this section of their Gospels. Of the list appended to this volume, if we except Ellicott, Townson, and Gilbert West, it is difficult to specify any writers who concern themselves with a detailed examination of the Scripture text. Yet even these too often fail to satisfy the inquirer on those difficulties suggested by the language of Scripture, or perhaps I should say, by the misinterpretations which have overgrown the language.[2]

It will be seen that what I have written is intended,

[1] *Questions of the Day, Inspiration, The Record.* Dec. 13, 1912.

[2] This may easily be seen from Chapter IX, where no fewer than six differences between the event recorded by S. Luke and that recounted by the first two Evangelists are summarized and discussed—differences not even hinted at by expositors unless to dismiss them as blunders of the historian or his informants.

not only for the clergy or students familiar with this controversy, but even much more for the ordinary English reader of the Bible. For his sake I have, not infrequently, entered into details of exegesis and definition, and also transliterated Greek words wherever they occur. The study of the Bible itself, as distinct from the reading of devotional books and commentaries upon the Scriptures, is admittedly a crying want of the present day. Would that this book might aid in awakening or strengthening the desire for such a study. Is it too much to hope that even a book like this may also arouse the attention of my brethren of the clergy to the vital importance of a more general pulpit teaching of Scripture than is at present prevalent? Ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures is one chief cause of the growing hostility to the authority of the Bible. On the ministry appointed of God for His Church lies the paramount duty of dispelling this ignorance, a duty efficiently discharged only where the laborious exposition of the same is recognized as claiming the fullest share of the preacher's time and study. May the Chief Shepherd of the sheep grant ever more and more to all whom He has called to feed the flock the will, the knowledge, the power, to "find pasture" [1] in that Word for the souls committed to their care.

[1] John x. 9.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER I. NO FACT NO FAITH - - 17

The Resurrection the cardinal truth of Christianity—Basis of teaching in the Apostolic Church—Chief object of attack by assailants of Christianity—Sadducean spirit still in the world—Resurrection and the Creed—Decadence of Scripture authority—Concessions to hostile critics—Modern criticism versus autoptic Gospels—Design of this book.

CHAPTER II. THE WITNESSES - - - 27

Evidence for the Resurrection — S. Paul and the Evangelists—Priority of the Evangelists' history of the Resurrection—The four Evangelists sole authorities for events of the Resurrection morning—Priority of S. Mark's Gospel a mere hypothesis—The Evangelists contemporary historians — S. Matthew and his Gospel—Authorship disputed by critics but on no scientific grounds—"The sheep shall be scattered"—Promise of the Comforter—In exclusive sense belongs only to the Apostles.

CHAPTER III. ANOTHER GOSPEL - - 41

The Synoptic Problem—Its object—To ascertain the source of the Gospel history—Substitutes a legendary for an autoptic original—Two assumptions of critics; (*a*) S. Mark's the earliest Gospel; (*b*) an earlier compilation, *Quelle*—Result of this criticism exemplified—(1) The "myrrhed wine"—(2) "Let him that readeth understand"—Not the Evangelists' interpretation of the Lord's discourse—How critics argue—Four Apostles sole auditors of the discourse

PAGE

—Hesitancy of modern Christian apologists unwarranted—Criticism as exemplified by Lake and Thompson—(3) The angel at the Tomb—Qualifications of S. Matthew as an historian—How supplanted by the critics—With what result—S. Matthew's "angel" no legendary outcome of S. Mark's "young man"—Why should S. Matthew copy S. Mark?—The guard at the Tomb—S. Matthew alone competent to relate it—Women's visit to the Tomb—Verbal disagre ments between S. Matthew and S. Mark—Trustworthiness of the Evangelists unshaken by criticism.

CHAPTER IV. CRUCIFIED AND DEAD - - 63

Gospel histories of the Passion and Resurrection—Fulness of detail—No difference in facts—Death of Christ—Fully attested—Special character of—The three hours' silence—"Why didst Thou forsake Me?"—Why omitted by S. Luke and S. John—The last "loud cry"—Unwarrantable omission in R.V.—Dean Burgon on—Omissions by S. John accounted for—(1) S. John records only what he witnessed—(2) Incidents foretold by O.T. prophets—Evangelists' variety in diction but agreement in fact when describing the Death of Christ.

CHAPTER V. AND BURIED - - - 75

Number and variety of witnesses of the entombment—Jews' application to Pilate—Why peculiar to S. John—Joseph of Arimathæa—Did Joseph consent to the death of Christ?—Critics' mistake—Interrogation by Caiaphas—Not identical with morning council related by S. Luke—Accuracy of S. Luke—Nicodemus—Mythical, according to critics—Peculiar to S. John—Criticism on the Tomb—An exploded theory revived—Differentiæ of Tomb by Evangelists—Opposed to Lake's hypothesis—Two groups of women witness entombment—Particularity of S. Luke's record—Last witnesses at the Tomb—The guard at the Tomb—Its historicity reasonable—S. Matthew alone of the four Evangelists competent to record it.

PAGE

CHAPTER VI. THE STONE ROLLED AWAY - 98

Five visits to the Tomb, not two, recorded in the Gospel narrative—First visit—By whom—And at what time made—S. Matthew's "Late on the Sabbath"—S. Matthew's introduction—Parenthetic—Contrasted with apocryphal narrative—Evangelist's restraint—Soldiers' story incidental evidence to the Resurrection—This visit in first two Gospels only—"To see" and "to anoint" not contradictory—Stone, when removed—Indifference of S. Matthew to details—"Rolled away" not contradicted by "taken away"—"Young man" or "angel"?—The angel's message—Commission to women for Apostles—"Other women" Matt. xxviii. 10—Note on "follow with."

CHAPTER VII. THE EMPTY TOMB - - 120

Second visit—Peculiar to S. John—A first-hand account—Tidings by Mary Magdalene—SS. John and Peter hurry to the Tomb—Alone at the Tomb—Theory of H. Latham—Disposition of linen cloths—"Napkin rolled up by itself"—S. Peter's inspection—Why S. John believed—Futility of Critics' objection.

CHAPTER VIII. THE RISEN LORD - - 127

Mary Magdalene—Experience at the Tomb—"Touch Me not"—"Detain Me not" impossible translation—"I ascend" not "I am going to ascend"—Christ's entrance into glory at His Resurrection—Not at Ascension—"My brethren" Brothers not Apostles—Mary's visit—Evidence for the empty Tomb—S. John and Mary first-hand witnesses—The two angels—Their appearances not functionless—Women not incompetent witnesses—Gilbert West's remarks.

CHAPTER IX. OTHER WOMEN AT THE TOMB - 139

Fourth visit—Only in S. Luke—Critics' objection to a second group of women—Untenable—Six differences between S. Luke's narrative and that of S. Matthew and S. Mark—(1) The women—(2) The

PAGE

entrance to Tomb—(3) Number of angels—(4) Words of angels—(5) Angels' words not interchangeable—(6) Diverse angelic greetings—Two separate events necessitated by these differences—More than angels intended by Cleopas's words—"Him they saw not"—Change in verse 10 by Revisers—Indicates two groups of women—"With them" meaning of—Congruity between Gospels and Evangelists.

CHAPTER X. MESSENGERS OF THE RISEN LORD 155

The Risen Lord and the women—Who were these women?—Not Mary and Salome—Intervening incidents between first visit and this meeting—Various solutions—Ellicott's—Townson's and Orr's—Cook's—Importance of the question—Interpolation in A.V.—"And behold" disconnects—S. Matthew's reminiscences—Identity of women in S. Matthew and S. Luke—One Evangelist's silence no contradiction to the narrative of another—Command to women—Sent to "my brothers"—W. J. Sparrow Simpson on lethargy of the Apostles—My brothers in N.T.—Evidentially important.

CHAPTER XI. THE TOMB REVISITED - - 177

S. Peter's visit to the Tomb—Only in S. Luke—Not recorded by S. John—Two accounts in S. Luke—Luke xxiv. 12 not to be deleted—R.V. note on—Additional evidence for the empty Tomb—"But" not "then" introducing verse—Cleopas's account v. 24—Identity between visits in S. Luke and S. John impossible—Narratives compared—Prominence of S. Peter in Resurrection narratives.

CHAPTER XII. RISEN INDEED - - - 185

Recapitulations of five visits—Number and variety of witnesses to these—A marvellous concord of testimony—No error to be proved against the four histories—Comparative absence of supernatural from the histories—Witnesses testify of what themselves had seen and heard.

PAGE

CHAPTER XIII. THE BODY OF HIS GLORY - 192

Resurrection Body—Analogy betwen the Lord's Resurrection Body and that of His people impossible —The former incorruptible and sinless—The Risen Jesus identical with the Jesus of the Gospels—Yet different in many particulars—Spiritual yet not immaterial—Errors: of those who make the Resurrection body wholly material—Spiritual—Only temporary—Opposed to Resurrection history—The Body entombed on Friday not in Tomb on Sunday—Seen and handled on same day—Body unchanged between Resurrection and Ascension—"Flesh and bones"—Not contradicted by "flesh and blood"—1 Cor. xv. 50—Materialism of Latin Fathers—Not unscriptural—Resurrection phenomena unique —Temporary assumption of material Body—Without Scripture warrant.

CHAPTER XIV. THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT - 212

Lessons from this history—(1) No errors on the part of the Evangelists demonstrable—Alleged discrepancies the fabrication of critics—E.g., Difference as to angel at the Tomb—Qualification of witnesses—(2) Necessity for studying the letter of Scripture—Episcopal teaching on "detain Me not"—A text of the Bishops' making—"Tell My brethren", i.e., Apostles—Not Scripture—(3) The Bible to be studied by the laity no less than by the clergy—Simplicity of Christ's language—Competence of a layman to understand the Resurrection narrative—The Berœan attitude—Effect of on the Church—Bible study in the pew a check upon the preacher—"He who reads may run" not "he who runs may read"—"The desire of all nations", What?—A Bible-studying people makes a Bible-teaching preacher.

LIST OF AUTHORS REFERRED TO - - 234

INDEX - - - - - - 237

The Evangelists and the Resurrection.

CHAPTER I.

NO FACT NO FAITH.

"If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain."—1 Cor. xv. 17, R.V.

THE Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ must ever remain the cardinal truth of the religion of Jesus, the great foundation fact on which the whole of Christianity is based.[1] The history of the Church opens with the announcement that, to fill the gap caused by the apostacy of Judas, there must needs be an election of one to "become a witness with us [the Apostles] of his resurrection."[2] This was a necessity, an essential, *a sine qua non*, without which no beginning could be made in the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Twelve who were to go forth into the world to preach Christ

[1] "Fact!" That is the key-word which still always binds together Christianity and science. Both stand absolutely on facts, on experience."—H. S. Holland, *The Foundations of Miracle*, in *Miracles*, p. 98.

[2] Acts i. 22, R.V.

must of necessity also go forth as witnesses of the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. And, accordingly, on the great Day of Pentecost, the birthday of the Church, when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles,[1] enduing them with power and authority for their ministry, S. Peter lays down the fact of the Resurrection as the one foundation for the proclamation of glad tidings to a lost and fallen world :—" This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses." [2] The same Apostle proclaims the same fact to account for the healing of the lame man :—It was He " whom God raised from the dead " who made the man whole in the presence of them all.[3] And this fact again is stated to be the secret of their evangelizing success after the Apostles' imprisonment by the Jewish council :—" With great power gave the apostles their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." [4] Similarly, when proclaiming the Gospel in the house of Cornelius, S. Peter bases his whole teaching on this fundamental fact :—" Him God raised up the third day ", adding further, that he and his fellow Apostles had been appointed as witnesses of this fact.[5]

Passing now to the ministry of S. Paul, we find the same fact underlying all his preaching. Thus, when he proclaimed his Gospel in the synagogue

" The Holy Ghost came down as at this time from heaven with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting *upon the Apostles*, to teach them, and to lead them to all truth."—*Book of Common Prayer, Holy Communion, Proper Pref. for Whitsunday.*

[2] Acts ii. 32, R.V. [3] Acts iii. 15, 16 ; iv. 10, R.V.
[4] Acts iv. 33, R.V. [5] Acts x. 40 ff., R.V.

at Antioch of Pisidia, he declared the Resurrection to be its strength and foundation :—" God raised him from the dead : and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people." [1] This is a remarkable testimony. S. Paul does not appear to have known the Lord in the flesh,[2] nor have we any evidence that he was himself at Jerusalem on the occasion of the death of Christ ; but, though the Risen Christ had appeared and spoken to him on the road to Damascus, he here makes no appeal to this personal incident in his own life, but goes back to the Resurrection fact itself and to the testimony which God's chosen witnesses were able to bear to it. Again, when the same Apostle visited Athens, it was his reiteration

[1] Acts xiii. 30, 31, R.V.

[2] " The question, ' Who art Thou, Lord ? ' preserved in all three narratives of his conversion, seems distinctly to imply that the appearance of the Lord was unknown to him, and this is a view which is confirmed by the allusion to the risen Christ in 1 Cor. xv. St. Paul there says that to him, the least of the Apostles, and not meet to be called an Apostle, Christ had appeared last of all, as to the abortive-born of the Apostolic family. And, indeed, it is inconceivable that Saul could in any real sense have seen Jesus in His lifetime."—Farrar, *The Life and Work of S. Paul*, ch. iv, p. 43.

This has become of some importance, since modern critics assert that there is no difference between the appearances of Jesus immediately after His Resurrection, to the Eleven and others, and His appearance to S. Paul at his conversion. It must not be forgotten, however, that what in the latter case was a revelation, was, in the former, a recognition. Jesus was recognized by the Eleven as the Master whom they had personally known throughout His ministry. He was revealed, as One unknown before, to S. Paul, who has to inquire " Who art Thou Lord ? "

of this fact of the Resurrection of Christ that excited the derision and mockery of its novelty-loving citizens :—" He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods : " they declared " because he preached Jesus and the resurrection." He set before them a future judgement in which the Judge was to be " The man whom he [God] hath ordained ; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." [1]

Turning now from the evangelizing work of the Apostles as related in the Acts, to the instruction of the Churches as embodied in their Letters, the same fact presents itself before us, the Resurrection is made the basis of every truth inculcated on the minds of the early Christians.

The Divinity of our Lord is declared to be manifested by His Resurrection from the dead.[2] The great doctrine of justification by faith is declared to be effected by the Resurrection of the Lord : " Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification." [3] And side by side with it, the doctrine of sanctification is bound up by S. Paul with the fact of the Resurrection of Christ : " Like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." [4] Again, the future resurrection and judgement of the saints are made to rest upon this same fact :—" But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit

[1] Acts xvii. 18, 31, R.V.
[2] Rom. i. 4, R.V.
[3] Rom. iv. 25, R V.
[4] Rom. vi. 4, R.V.

that dwelleth in you."[1] "Who is he that shall condemn? Shall Christ Jesus that died, yea, rather, that was raised from the dead?"[2] Belief in the fact is actually made the condition of salvation:—"If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."[3] By S. Paul and S. Peter the same fact is adduced as the instrument of the new birth:—"Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead."[4] So also S. Peter:—God "who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead."[5] The same connexion, between the Resurrection of Christ and the hope of the believer, is also preserved by S. Paul when he reminds the Thessalonians of their conversion:—"To wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead."[6]

Such texts as these, from a great mass that might be cited, sufficiently show the stress laid by the Apostles, in both their preaching and teaching, upon the simple fact of the Resurrection. For—I again repeat it—we must observe, it is a fact and not a doctrine.[7] That upon which the Apostles

[1] Rom. viii. 11; and 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14.
[2] Rom. viii. 34, R.V. marg. [3] Rom. x. 9, R.V.
[4] Col. ii. 12, R.V.
[5] 1 Pet. i. 3, R.V.; cp. also iii. 21, R.V.
[6] 1 Thess. i. 10, R.V.
[7] "Ménégoz, in his 'Certitude de la Foi,' goes deeper than this, because he insists that Christianity is a religion which stands in a unique relation to history, seeing that it is bound up

based their call to repentance, upon which they built up their whole teaching as to faith in Christ, the life of holiness, the hope of future glory, was the stupendous and yet indisputable fact, that One had appeared in Palestine who lived, and taught, and did good, who was put to death upon the cross, and laid in the grave, and on the third day rose, and manifested Himself to more than five hundred witnesses. Could this fact have been disputed or denied, Christianity could not have come into being; the hope of future glory, the incentive to a holy life, must have utterly perished. Or, to sum up in the words of the Apostle S. Paul:—"If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain." [1]

Now if the Resurrection of Jesus be a fact of such vital consequence to the life and hope of the Church, it is no wonder that it has become the central point of attack by the great enemy of Christ and His Church. The character and spirit of the Sadducee is still the character and spirit of the world:—"The Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." [2] The Sadducee is "sore troubled" because Apostles "proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead." [3] And still the world would fain persuade itself that there is no Resurrection, neither angel nor spirit, that there

inseparably with the fortunes of Person. The separation of Christianity from history is acknowledged to be impossible."—W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p 117.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 14, R.V. [2] Acts xxiii. 8, R.V.

[3] Acts iv. 2, R.V.

is no world beyond that which it sees or handles. And still the world is sore troubled when men proclaim a resurrection of the buried body because Jesus died and was raised again on the third day.

It is needless to remind the reader of the fierce controversy at present being waged throughout Christendom touching the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord. It need excite no wonder so long as we remember the importance of the facts and the perpetual hostility of the world. In this volume I am concerned only with the Resurrection of the Lord, and here the wonder is that teachers and preachers of a Church whose creed confesses: *I believe that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into hell. The third day He rose again from the dead,* can be found to assert that they believe in this Resurrection, and with the same breath to declare that they do not believe "in the miraculous resuscitation of a dead body."[1] What is the miraculous resuscitation of a dead body if not its resurrection? And when a clergyman declares that he believes in one but not in the other, are we to understand him to mean that he believes in the resurrection of the soul or spirit? Do these modern opponents of the Resurrection mean to assert that the soul which has already quitted its earthly tenement can be recaptured and laid in a house of clay by the hand of man? Yet, if they believe that it is a spirit only which is raised (as they say they believe in the Resurrection), they must believe that it is the same

[1] Rev. J. M. Thompson, letter to Bp. of London in *The Guardian*, Nov. 10, 1911.

spirit which was buried. From the beginning of the world to the present moment has any one, speaking of a resurrection, ever thought of the rising of anything except that which was buried ? [1]

But I am not concerned here with this form of attack. The danger which I desire to meet in the following pages is one which, I cannot help thinking, lies behind this novel and, to so many, incomprehensible assault upon the miracle of the Lord's Resurrection—I mean the slow but increasing decadence in the mind of Christians of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. Most of all is this apparent in the Gospel history of the Resurrection. Here, if anywhere, we might expect certainty as to the facts recorded. Yet, what is the case ? Who is there that is not familiar with the perpetual recurrence of apologies and excuses for what the four Evangelists have, or have not, said as to this or that incident in the eventful history which they record ? We are told that, there is a discrepancy between this Evangelist and that, that another has confused two accounts, or, perhaps inadvertently, mis-stated what was reported to him, that one, or more, has failed to discern what was exaggerated or erroneous in the reports made to them by terrified or excited women—women who could not well tell whether it were one or two angels that spoke to them, or, indeed, whether the speaker were angel or man.

These and such-like concessions, let it be remem-

[1] " The belief which made Christianity what it is was belief in the Resurrection, and by that was meant belief in the Risen body."—H. S. Holland, *The Power of the Resurrection*, in *Miracles*, p. 133.

This subject is further dealt with in ch. xiii.

bered, I give, not as the utterances of hostile critics: on the contrary, they are comments to be met with everywhere in works written by learned and godly teachers and defenders of the faith, of which ample evidence will be found in the following pages. Here, I note it to mark the effect of such statements. If those who reverence the Truth of God allow themselves such doubts and misgivings as regards the vital and fundamental fact of their religion, small wonder that hostile criticism has gladly seized upon their admissions to discredit the whole history. They bid us note the slips, the discrepancies, the contradictions, the blunders, which, they say, pervade the Gospel narrative throughout ; and then they present us with a theory which is thought to account satisfactorily for all. Neither Matthew, nor Mark, nor Luke, nor John, they say, was the author of the Gospel which bears his name. None is the work of a writer contemporary with the event he records. Generations passed before a single Gospel appeared, and in that interval there grew up a mass of tradition accumulated round the Apostolic teaching that formed its basis, which, being at last collected, was given—when and by whom cannot be known—to the Church as the teaching of the Evangelist whose name each bears.[1]

It is necessary to remember this in studying the

[1] Some words of Dr. Salmon's are here very much to the point :—"For this statement [Renan's] that for a century men had no scruple in transposing, combining, and interpolating the Evangelic records, there is not a shadow of proof."—*Introd. to the N.T.* (ninth ed.), p. 87.

Gospel history of the Resurrection. For it is on a gospel thus compiled and dated, if we are to accept this theory, that we are to rely for evidence, instead of on the contemporary witness of the men to whom the Church for nineteen centuries has looked as the real authors of the four Gospels.[1] But, if this be so, of what worth is such evidence? Who, of the multitudinous critics that clamour for a hearing, can decide for us which, in the whole medley of traditions, is to be looked on as testimony that will stand a moment's inspection?

The design, therefore, of the present writer is simply to call back the minds of Christians to a fresh study of this portion of the Word of God; to invite them, in the midst of the turmoil and doubt which are at present agitating the Church, to read once more, patiently and prayerfully, the words which alone can make wise unto salvation, that so, by the Holy Spirit's aid, they may be *established in the truth which is with them.*[2]

[1] "Towards the end of the second century our four Gospels were universally accepted in the Catholic Church as the peculiarly trustworthy records of the Saviour's life, and they were then ascribed to the same authors as those to whom we now ascribe them."—Salmon, *Introd. to the N. T.* (ninth ed.), p. 57.

[2] See 2 Pet. i. 12, R.V.

CHAPTER II.

THE WITNESSES.

"Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."—Acts x. 40, 41, R.V.

Our knowledge of the Resurrection fact depends ultimately upon the narratives of the four Evangelists. It is necessary to call attention to this, as the assault which is now made by critics upon the miracle of the Resurrection has here assumed a new form. It has added the witness of S. Paul to the witness of the four Evangelists. The negative criticism, as we may call it, has chosen to co-ordinate S. Paul with the four Evangelists because, in reciting the creed of the early Church, he has added his own name as that of one to whom the Lord vouchsafed an appearance after His Resurrection.[1] I refer to the passage, 1 Cor. xv. 3—8, R.V. :—"I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according

[1] So Professor K. Lake :—"It is, however, well to emphasise at once that St. Paul does not recognise any difference between the appearance to himself and the appearances to the other witnesses."—*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 34.

to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep; then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles; and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, he appeared to me also."

The use made of this passage by critics may be briefly stated. Because S. Paul describes the appearances of the risen Lord to himself by the same word by which he describes His earlier appearances to the Apostles and disciples in Jerusalem and Galilee, critics argue, first, that the appearance to S. Paul was only a vision beheld subjectively by the Apostle, and not the objective presence of the Lord Himself; and, in the next place, that as this appearance of Christ to S. Paul was only a vision so the appearances of the risen Lord related in the Gospels were likewise visions only.

The limits of this book will not allow me to enter upon the question whether the Lord appeared to S. Paul on the road to Damascus subjectively or objectively, that is, whether he saw only a vision, or actually beheld the Lord Himself. The subject has been discussed at length by Dr. Sparrow Simpson in *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, and by Professor Orr in his book, *The Resurrection of Jesus*. It is sufficient for me to point out that the appearance of the Lord to S. Paul and the appearances related in the Gospels bear differences so marked as to demand our most serious consideration.

While insisting strongly and decidedly that the appearance of the Lord to S. Paul was no mere vision, but an actual revelation of Himself made by the Lord Himself to the eyes of the Apostle ; Jesus was " The Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way " [1] ; we must at the same time insist that the manifestations of the same Lord to the disciples, as related in the Gospels, are so different as to make their evidence as superior in character as they are prior in point of time to that of the appearance to S. Paul. No doubt the Lord Jesus appeared to him, and the appearance convinced him that the Jesus whom he saw and heard was the same Jesus who was beheld by the several persons enumerated in his letter. But let us observe how different were two at least of the appearances in this enumeration from that witnessed by S. Paul.

S. Paul was on the road to Damascus, approaching the city, some weeks, if not months, after the Resurrection, when the Lord appeared and spoke to him from heaven. But in this the Apostle was not in the same position as regards his testimony to the Resurrection with the Eleven or Cephas, whom he mentions. He was not in or near Jerusalem ; the time was not the morning of the Resurrection ; Jesus, whom he beheld above him, was not standing in a garden ; nor walking on a Jerusalem road ; nor entering an upper room when the doors were shut ; nor submitting to be touched and handled by human hands ; nor demanding, and

[1] Spoken by Ananias, Acts ix. 17, R.V. Compare also S. Paul's own words :—" Have I not seen Jesus our Lord ? "——1 Cor. ix. 1, R.V.

taking, and eating, of the food lying upon the table. All this constitutes an immense difference between the attestation of Resurrection facts by the Evangelists and that borne by S. Paul in this Letter to the Corinthians.[1] This reference, therefore, can give no warrant for further identification than that Jesus whom S. Paul saw was the Risen Lord, and the same known to the Apostles before and after His Resurrection. And though the histories of the Evangelists, any or all of them, may have appeared later than S. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, the Resurrection facts recorded by them are earlier than the one of which he writes, besides being altogether different in the circumstances under which they occurred.

For these reasons I cannot believe, as many seem to do, that the evidence for the Resurrection of the Lord as furnished by S. Paul can be co-ordinated with, far less substituted for, the inspired history given to us in the four Gospels. The facts of this history are so ample and varied, attested moreover throughout by so many, and so many kinds of witnesses, that the devout and reverent student of the Word of God must feel compelled to direct his attention first, and mainly, to that evidence to which God Himself appears to have assigned special

[1] In face of these differences I cannot comprehend why Dr. Sparrow Simpson ridicules Paley's opinion "That 'the testimony of those who had conversed with Jesus after His Resurrection in the ordinary and natural way of human perception' was 'the most direct and satisfactory proof'"; and questions the fact that the testimony of S. Paul was "other in kind from theirs."—*The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 240.

prominence by giving it the first place and fullest detail in the writing of the New Testament.

It was this evidence that satisfied the Church of the Apostles' days and to which the Apostles themselves appealed everywhere in their proclamation of the Gospel of the Resurrection. In the preaching even of S. Paul himself this fact stands out on one occasion with singular clearness. I have alluded in the preceding chapter to S. Paul's address in the synagogue at Antioch, where he rested his appeal to his hearers on the Resurrection of Christ. In evidence of the truth of that Resurrection, he cited as witnesses the men who followed the Lord from Galilee. Now, if the Apostle considered himself qualified by the manifestation of Christ to him, to be a witness of His Resurrection, why did he not appeal to this fact ; or why, passing by his own experience, did he so emphatically appeal to the actual and original witnesses of the miracle ? S. Paul's words are :—" They took him down from the tree, and laid him in a tomb. But God raised him from the dead : and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people."[1]

Surely, a passage like this furnishes a marked distinction between the testimony to the post-resurrection appearances of the Lord borne by S. Paul and that testified to it by the Twelve. We have no evidence to lead us to suppose that S. Paul

[1] Acts xiii. 29-31, R.V.

had ever beheld the Lord before His Crucifixion.[1] We have no reason whatever to believe that he was in Jerusalem at the time of the Lord's death.[2] His testimony, therefore, to the living Jesus, though true and convincing, is plainly not one identifying the Risen Jesus with a Jesus beheld before His death. The appearing of Christ to him was, as I have before said, a revelation ; that to the Apostles, a recognition. The difference, therefore, between the Pauline evidence and that of the Twelve is so great as at once to prevent our concluding that one can be co-ordinate with the other.

This much, then, I conclude was necessary, but surely it is enough, to limit our authorities for the events of the Resurrection morning to the four Gospels : Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. And on these four writers, who give as all that we can know with any certainty concerning the life, and death, and resurrection, of Jesus Christ, it will be necessary to make two or three observations.

(1) In the history of the Resurrection there is no valid reason for the assertion, so often made, that any one of these writers is dependent on any of the other three. Nor is there any solid ground for the assumption that S. Mark's Gospel was written before

[1] " It is not really probable that S. Paul had ever seen Jesus during His ministry."—W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 178.

[2] " If S. Paul had been present in Jerusalem during the trial of our Lord, it is difficult to suppose that he would not have taken part ; and then some trace would surely remain, either in the historian's narrative, or in S. Paul's Epistles."—*Ibid.*, p. 200.

all the rest.[1] The basis of the new "modern criticism" is that S. Mark's was the first Gospel to be written, and that each of the other Evangelists had a copy of this before him when writing his own Gospel,[2] which he added to, or abbreviated, or altered, at will, to suit the scope and design of his narrative.

Now, so far as the priority of writing goes, and

[1] "Does it follow, then, that Mark's was the earliest Gospel of all, and that it was used by the other two Evangelists? Not necessarily; and the result of such comparison as I have been able to make is to lead me to believe that Matthew and Luke did not copy Mark, but that all drew from a common source which, however, is represented most fully and with most verbal exactness in St. Mark's version. It is even possible that the second Gospel may be the latest of the three. It contains a good deal more than the Petrine tradition; and it is conceivable that when Mark was asked to record that tradition, he chose to complete it into a Gospel; and that he may even have used in his work the other two Synoptics, which may have been then already written. Whether they were so or not is a question on which I do not feel confidence in taking a side."—Salmon, *Introd. to the N. T.* (ninth ed.), p. 140 f.

In fairness, I ought to add that this criticism of Dr. Salmon is largely modified in his volume, published after his death, *The Human Element in the Gospels.*

To the same effect, and stronger, is the opinion of Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas, Professor of O. T. Literature and Exegesis Wycliffe College, Toronto, recently expressed in his *In Conference* notes in *The Record* of May 31, 1912. Having stated six objections to the acceptance of the priority of S. Mark he writes:—"The whole question is still being thoroughly discussed, and the current number of the *Hibbert Journal* shows the state of flux. One great German authority complains that as long as S. Mark's priority is regarded as settled, Synoptic criticism stands stock still; while an English writer on the same subject believes that the priority of S. Mark involves Gospel criticism in a *cul de sac.*"

[2] "In the main it is likely that the authors of the First and Third Gospels had Mark before them practically in its present form."—A. S. Peake, *A Crit. Introd. to the N. T.*, p. 115.

perhaps also the possession of S. Mark's Gospel by the other Evangelists, the most that can be said is that such a case is possible. But with equal truth it may be asserted that it is fully as possible that no one Evangelist—S. John possibly excepted—ever saw the work of any of his brother Evangelists. Dean Alford tells us: "The testimony of the early Church is unanimous, that Matthew wrote *first* among the Evangelists. Clement of Alexandria, who dissented from the present order of our Gospels, yet placed those of Matthew and Luke first."[1] As to the dates of the first three Gospels so many and varied are the opinions of scholars that it is simply impossible to decide with certainty which Gospel was first written.[2] It is most important that this alternative be borne in mind by students of the Resurrection history. For, it is hardly exaggeration to say that the whole strength of the modern criticism lies in the hypothesis—it is only a

[1] *The Gr. Test.*, vol. i, *Proleg.*, p. 30. This testimony, so far as I know, remains unquestioned.

[2] How critics differ in dating the Gospels may be seen from the following:—

MATTHEW.—Alford, *before* 70; W. C. Allen, 65–75; J. V. Bartlet, *circa* 68–9; A. Harnack 70–5; Leighton Pullan, almost certainly a little before 70; V. H. Stanton, before 100; Abp. W. Thomson, 50–60.

MARK.—Alford, *after the year* 63, before 70; Dr. Samuel Davidson, 120; A. Harnack, 65–70; Hitzig, 55–7; Keim, 115–20; Kŏstlin, 100–10; Leighton Pullan, probably *circa* 61; J. A. Robinson, 65; S. D. F. Salmond, early in 70; Schenkel, 45–58; V. H. Stanton, not much before 70; Swete, before 70; Abp. W. Thomson, 63–70; Volkmar, 73; Weiss, about 67.

LUKE.—Alford, between 50 and 58; Ll. J. M. Bebb, *circa* 80; Blass, 56; A Harnack 78–93; Leighton Pullan, probably *circa* 63; J. A Robinson, shortly after 70; V. H. Stanton, not much later than 80; Abp. W. Thomson, 58–60.

hypothesis—that S. Mark's was the first Gospel to be written.[1]

(2) Another observation that ought to be remembered is this, That the authors of the four Gospels must be regarded as writers of contemporaneous history and not as the collectors and purveyors of traditions handed down through a succession of narrators. They; in S. Luke's case, the authorities relied upon; were themselves actual participators in the events they record. This fact is unquestionable. S. John, relating the Crucifixion, declares of himself:—"He that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true."[2] Both he and S. Matthew were chosen, with the other Apostles, by the Lord at the beginning of His ministry, "That they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach."[3] S. Mark, though not an Apostle, appears to have been an early disciple, dwelling at Jerusalem with his mother Mary, and therefore familiar with the Apostles and other actors in the first days of the Church's history. And S. Luke explicitly declares of his authorities, *they who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word* "delivered" unto us "those matters which have been fulfilled among us."[4] Thus it is plain that while S. Matthew and S. John related the history

[1] Blass writes:—"I think that Luke finished his Gospel in the year 56, if we follow Eusebeius, or if any one prefers Zahn's chronology, in the year 60." (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 34.) Next page, he states that Harnack "puts Mark's Gospel between 65 and 70 A.D., Matthew's between 70 and 75, but Luke's much later, about 78–93."

[2] John xix. 35, R.V. [3] Mark iii. 14, R.V.

[4] See Luke i. 1, 2, R.V

of the Lord in which they themselves took part, S. Mark and S. Luke gave their narratives as they came to them direct from the men and women who were concerned in them.

Of course critics are quick to remind us that we have no contemporary evidence that S. Matthew was the author of the Gospel that bears his name. This is true. But from the earliest times this Gospel has been assigned to S. Matthew, and, what is more significant, no other name was ever suggested as the author. In the words of Dr. Salmon: "If Matthew did not write the first Gospel, I do not think the name of Matthew would have been necessary to gain it acceptance in the Church. In any case, the fact of this acceptance by the Church may suffice for our faith."[1] Until, then, some adequate reason be found showing, either that Matthew was incapable of writing such a Gospel, or, that some other writer was the real author, there is really no scientific ground for disputing the claim made by the early Church, for the authorship of the Gospel by the Apostle Matthew. The criticism which sets aside his authorship is purely hypothetical and lacks any testimony from antiquity for its support. It supposes the Gospel not to have been written by the man who is said to have written it. It supposes that some disciples of its supposed author collected some detached records and put them together. It then supposes that other Christians subsequently altered,

[1] *Introd. to the N.T.* (ninth ed.), p. 174.

"In view of this early date [before 70 A.D.] we cannot say that St. Matthew himself did not write the book."—Leighton Pullan, in Murray's *Bible Dict.*

or corrected, or added to, this narrative; and it supposes that from these "redactors", as the critics call them, we have obtained our present Gospel. Such criticism can have but one result, the absolute destruction of the Gospel as a reliable and trustworthy record of the life, and death, and resurrection, of our Blessed Lord.

I hold, then, that S. Matthew, as the author of the Gospel and a disciple of the Lord, both from his worldly vocation and also from his personal acquaintance with the Lord's ministry, is entitled to be regarded as a competent and trustworthy historian of all that he relates. And this is especially the case in regard to his account of the crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection, of Christ.

It is assumed,[1] and not only by the new critics, that the Apostles could not have been present at the Lord's Crucifixion; and upon this assumption critics rest their theory of the "Galilæan tradition", that when the disciples in Gethsemane forsook the Lord, they fled to Galilee, where the Lord appeared to them immediately after His Resurrection. But why are we to assume this? It is true that the Lord had said: "All ye shall be offended in me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee."[2] It is true that in a momentary panic all

[1] As by Keim :—"They [the Apostles] had not witnessed His passion, His disgrace, His dying, His burial, since, finally, they in Galilee, far from the disasters and the graves of Jerusalem, stood again entirely upon His ground and theirs."—*Jesus of Nazara* (quoted in Sparrow Simpson's *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 113). [2] Matt. xxvi. 31, 32, R.V.

the Apostles actually forsook Him and fled.[1] But no sooner was the Lord apprehended and brought before the High Priest than we find S. Peter, the Apostle who had just struck off Malchus's ear, together with "another disciple", presumably S. John,[2] among the servants in the High Priest's palace. If these were not afraid to trust themselves in a place of such danger and at such a time, why are we to suppose that they, along with the rest of the Apostles, would not be found among that company of sympathizers of whom S. Luke writes: "And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed with him from Galilee, stood afar off, seeing these things"?[3] To an unbiased mind, the probability that they were present, I think, far outweighs the presumption that men so attached to their Master would not, after the first moment of panic was over, have regained their courage and retraced their steps, if only to see what might befall One so dear to them. At any rate, without something more in Scripture than we possess to prove it, I cannot believe that in such circumstances the Eleven were not present to see what the end would be. Without such Scripture, are we not conceding too much to the adversary, who is not slow to make use of the smallest point of vantage against the miracle of the Resurrection?

(3) The last observation I would make is of vital importance. On no account must we forget that if certain words of our Lord regarding the work of the Holy Spirit have any meaning whatever, they

[1] See Matt. xxvi. 56. [2] John xviii. 15, 16: see Westcott, *in loc.*
[3] Luke xxiii. 49, R.V.

have a special application to the historians of the death and burial and resurrection of the Lord. On the night before His crucifixion He gave to the Apostles, assembled with Him in the upper room, this promise: "The Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you."[1] These words, I need not remind the reader, are commonly explained of the ordinary influences exercised upon believers by the Holy Spirit. To quote a popular writer:—"To my eyes they seem a general promise, primarily, no doubt, applying specially to the eleven, but after them belonging also to all believers in every age."[2] But are we to suppose that the ordinary operation of the Holy Ghost, in purifying and illuminating the thoughts and imaginations and affections of every believer, is that which our Lord intended when He addressed these words to His Apostles? I cannot believe it. If they have any signification at all as spoken to the Apostles, it is this, That they convey to them the assurance of a supernatural gift of the Holy Ghost to "teach", that is, to impart to them a knowledge of the things Christ desired them to know and publish, together with a supernatural bringing to their recollection of all that He had communicated to them while they had companied with Him during His ministry in Galilee and Judæa. And if one desired to put into concise and intelligible language the words one might suppose the Lord would use to give authority

[1] John xiv. 26, R.V.

[2] Bp. J. C. Ryle, *Expository Thoughts on S. John, in loc.*

to write, or decide upon what was written, as the Scriptures of God, what words more terse, more direct, more plain, could He have employed than these words addressed to His Apostles? The very expression, "bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you", actually necessitates an exclusive reference to the Apostles. It was to them, and to them only, He had spoken the words to which He refers; and to them, and to them only, could the recollection of these words be brought back by the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit after He descended upon the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost.

All this, of course, will be resented by those who deny the possibility of miracle and who reject the superhuman side in the composition of the Sacred Scriptures. But with such words spoken by the Lord to His Apostles, on the eve of His departure, concerning the mission of the Holy Ghost, so soon to descend upon them with the miraculous accompaniment of tongues of fire together with the gift of divers tongues, these words of our Lord receive, I think, their true signification only when applied to the Twelve, whom Christ thus designated as the authorized expounders of His mind and will. If this view be accepted, as I fully accept it, there is left no room for the discrepancies, or contradictions, or blunders, so freely alleged against the Gospels. They become impossible to men taught by the Holy Spirit, who has brought to their recollection whatever Christ said unto them. And if this be true of the Gospels in general, more especially do I hold it to be true of the Gospel history of the fundamental fact of Christianity, the death and burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER III.

ANOTHER GOSPEL.

"Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."—Gal. i. 8, R.V.

From the preceding chapter it will be seen that I hold that we have in the four Gospels an authoritative as well as trustworthy record of the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection, of the Lord Jesus. That the authors with whose names the four Gospels are respectively identified are responsible for the truth and historicity of their contents, has been until very recent times the undoubted belief of the Church through all the centuries of her existence. In recent years, however, the question has been started, How came these Gospels to be written? Where did each of the several writers obtain his information? How did the several events of the Lord's life come to be written in the order observable through the first three; that is, as they are called, the Synoptic Gospels, with the likenesses common to all or the differences peculiar to each?

Now, deeply interesting as these questions are, the impossibility of their obtaining reliable answers at this distance of time, must be apparent even to the most careless observer. Beyond the information furnished to us by S. Luke as to his mode of working

in the preparation of his Gospel, the Synoptists give us not the slightest hint as to how they worked, or to whom they were indebted for the doings or sayings which they record. But from the fact that S. Luke, disclaiming the authority of an eyewitness or minister of the word, declares that he "traced the course of all things accurately from the first"[1], we might infer a distinction between the writing of his and of the first two Gospels. Remembering that S. Matthew was an Apostle of the Lord, and S. Mark in all probability His disciple and writing under the direction of the Apostle Peter, it is the most natural inference, in the absence of any proof to the contrary, that if they were the authors of the Gospels which bear their names, these Gospels were autoptic, the outcome and recollection of what their writers had seen and heard during the ministry of their Divine Master.

With this answer, however, the inexorable demand of modern Biblical investigation is not satisfied. Impossible as it seems to be to obtain, after nineteen centuries have passed away, any external evidence as to the writing of these Gospels, modern criticism has instituted a vigorous and searching investigation of the Gospels themselves, on which it hopes to found a theory which shall sufficiently explain how these came to assume their present form. With very insufficient and very questionable data, it supposes S. Mark to have been the earliest of all the Gospels, and, from a similarity between the order of its events and that observed in S. Matthew and S. Luke, it is further supposed that the authors

[1] Luke i. 3, R.V.

of these two Gospels were indebted to S. Mark, whose history they altered, augmenting or abbreviating it at will.[1]

But further, in both the first and third Gospels there are lengthy extracts of the sayings of Jesus, of which no trace is to be found in S. Mark's Gospel. Modern criticism therefore supposes another Gospel to have been circulated in the Apostolic or sub-Apostolic Church, to which it has assigned the name of *Quelle*, that is, *spring* or *source*, and from which it supposes the writers of the first and third Gospels to have drawn their accounts. It is needless to add that all this is pure imagination. Not a hint of this *Quelle*, or any work like it, is to be found in any age or any place in Christendom. Criticism has invented the volume and, by a process peculiarly its own, has sought to prove the reality of its existence.

[1] Professor K. Lake states the method of the new criticism as follows :—"As time went on Christians began to ask for written statements bearing on the life and teaching of Christ. Probably these statements took three forms—a collection of passages bearing on the fulfilment of prophecy by Christ ; a collection of his sayings ; and a description of his life. Of the first two kinds no unmixed examples are extant, but the third is represented by the gospel of Mark. A little later there came the inevitable attempt to facilitate instruction by combining these three types of documents into one. Of these attempts we have in the canonical New Testament two examples. Matthew represents a combination of Mark with at least one document which gave the sayings of the Lord, probably also with one which gave prophecies and their fulfilment, and with fresh material of various kinds drawn by the compiler from other sources. In the same way S. Luke compiled his gospel from Mark, at least one document containing sayings which was also used in Matthew, and from special sources of his own."—*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 7, 8.

With the discussion of this very difficult problem I am not here concerned. All that I want to show is the fact, the very momentous fact, that emerges from this so-called Synoptic Problem; that the result, so far, is to substitute for three Gospels whose authority and truthfulness have never been disproved, whose accepted authors were contemporaneous with the events they record, and two of them certainly inhabitants of the country in which their history was enacted; a book coming from nobody knows where, written by nobody knows whom, and of which not a single line can be supposed with any certainty to have come from one who was an eyewitness and minister of the Word.

My object, then, in this chapter is, by a few selected examples, to show the reader how this criticism, by its mode of procedure, must necessarily destroy all confidence in the truth and authority of the Holy Gospels. And first, in his account of the Crucifixion, Mark (xv. 23) tells us that the soldiers who led Jesus to Golgotha offered him "wine mingled with myrrh", literally "myrrhed wine": S. Matthew (xxvii. 34) states that what the soldiers offered was vinegar[1] "mingled with gall." Now the critics, assuming S. Mark to be the earliest of our Gospels and also that S. Matthew had this before him while writing the first Gospel, hold that the myrrhed wine of S. Mark is the true description of what was offered to our Lord; and further tell us that S. Matthew, or, if you will, the author who assumes his name, copying S. Mark, deliberately changed his *myrrh* into *gall* in order to accommodate

[1] The Revisers here read "wine."

the fact to the prophecy (Ps. lxix. 21) which he supposed it to fulfil.[1] Now this criticism springs from the desire to make the second Gospel earlier than the first, and at the same time to account for the difference between the two records.

But how must such a criticism strike the mind of every honest intelligent Englishman? Will he not at once ask himself, Am I then to believe that S. Matthew, or whoever wrote under his name, uttered a deliberate falsehood in stating that our Lord was offered gall in the drink held to him, when it was really myrrh, merely to induce his readers to believe in a prophecy which otherwise might not be taken to be literally fulfilled? And yet this is the result necessarily following on such a criticism.

On the other hand, supposing we are in no hurry to assume the priority of S. Mark's Gospel and the hypothesis that the first Evangelist copied the second, are we to be accounted unscholarly if we assert that the statements of both Evangelists are equally true? S. Mark declares, what he knew to be the fact, that the liquor presented to the Lord was indeed myrrhed wine, that is, wine flavoured with myrrh, a beverage neither unknown nor uncommon at that time.[2] So too, we are as much

[1] Even Alford, reverent commentator as he is, has fallen into this error :—"We may observe here (and if the remark be applied with caution and reverence, it is a most useful one), how Matt. often adopts in his narrative *the very words of prophecy*, where one or more of the other Evangelists give the matter of fact detail." —*The Gr. Test.*, Matt. xxvii. 34.

[2] See Edersheim (*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 208), who mentions this myrrhed wine among the beverages used at meals in the time of our Lord.

entitled to assume that gall must have been added to this myrrhed wine (when or why is quite immaterial) as the critics are to assume that the first Evangelist falsified the fact for some special purpose of his own. Both are only assumptions, one as possible as the other; only with this difference, that the assumption of the critics shatters the veracity of the history and blemishes the honour and integrity of the Apostle. It is a true remark "We have no right to propound a hypothesis which makes the Gospel statements inconceivable, and then to declare that one or other must be necessarily untrue."[1]

A second instance will exemplify the methods and consequences of the new criticism. When Dr. Henry A. W. Meyer, the celebrated German theologian, commenting on the Lord's discourse to four of His Apostles on the Mount of Olives,[2] noted the spuriousness of the words "Spoken of by Daniel the prophet" in S. Mark's report, he endorsed Bengel's observation that the words, "Let him that readeth understand" are not part of the Lord's discourse, but only an inserted comment of the

[1] W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 20.

To the same effect, that acute scholar, Bishop Thirlwall: "When the question is between two interpretations, one of which is free from all difficulty, while the other is open to such grave objections as to appear to many competent judges absolutely inadmissible and grammatically impossible, that which is free from difficulty will have a clear claim to preference, though something be alleged which may be thought in some degree to weaken the force of the objections raised against the other."—*Essays, Speeches and Sermons*, Appendix, p. 468.

[2] *Comm. on the N.T.*, Matt. xxiv. 15.

Evangelist. This opinion was adopted in England by Dean Alford, whose influence, no doubt, has contributed to its wider acceptance by Biblical scholars of the last half-century. But critics have not been satisfied to stop here. They argue that since the first two Evangelists have interpolated the narrative of the Lord with the same words, and at precisely the same point in His discourse, it is most probable, either that one copied from the other, or that both employed some prior document when composing their Gospels. Thus it is numbered among the frequent "insignificant phrases which are often found in parallel texts", upon which critics base their conclusion that the three Synoptic Gospels are compilations gathered from some previous, though unknown, document in circulation amongst the early Christians.[1] On this account it becomes the imperative duty of every reader of the Gospels to ascertain for himself whether or not this conclusion is founded on anything more than mere assumptions.

That the words "Spoken of by Daniel the prophet" were not originally a part of S. Mark's Gospel is undoubtedly the judgement of textual critics. The words are excluded on sufficient manuscript authority. But why should their omission necessitate the opinion that the following words, "Let him that readeth understand", were not spoken by the Lord as part of His discourse, but are merely

[1] See A. S. Peake, *A Crit. Introd. to the N.T.*, p. 109; and H. B. Swete, *The Gospel acc. to S. Mark*, xiii. 14, who writes :— "This parenthesis finds a place both in Mt. and Mc., and probably belonged to a common source."

a comment interjected by the writer of the Gospel? Not only is such an interruption unexampled in the Gospels,[1] but the reference to Daniel's prophecy, even though the prophet's name be omitted, is so clear and unmistakable as to leave no doubt in the mind of the unbiased reader that Jesus Himself was referring to that prophecy and that He spoke the words, "Let him that readeth understand."[2] "The mention of 'the abomination of desolation' necessarily implies an allusion to Daniel, even if that prophet is not cited by name."[3]

So far, then, as S. Mark is concerned, the opinion that the words "Let him that readeth understand" were not spoken by the Lord is wholly gratuitous. It is unnecessary as an elucidation of the Lord's discourse, and it is opposed to the practice of the Evangelists, who nowhere interpolate words of their own in reporting discourses of the Lord.

But there are further assumptions necessary to the critics' conclusion. There are words in S. Matthew's Gospel which must be got rid of before it can be admitted that it was the writer of that Gospel, and not the Lord, who used the words, "Let him that readeth understand." This, however, presents no difficulty to modern criticism.

[1] See Dr. P. Schaff in Lange's *Comm. on the N.T.*, Matt. xxiv. 15, note.

[2] The language of Stier (*The Words of the Lord Jesus*, vol. iii, p. 263), condemning the opposite view, is not a whit too strong. He writes:—"That the parenthetical remark has been inserted by *two* Evangelists, as an addition of their own, remains so inexplicable and unexampled, that we, agreeing with Hengstenberg, cannot enough wonder how Bengel could have entertained such a supposition."

[3] F. C. Cook, in *Speaker's Comm.*, Matt. xxiv. 15.

The words "Spoken of by Daniel the prophet" are indeed unquestioned as part of S. Matthew's Gospel; they are found in all MSS. But what of that? Critics have an easy way of solving such difficulties. "The words are in our documents, no doubt; but then," they say "as they are wanting in S. Mark's Gospel, it is not probable, indeed it is scarcely possible, that the writer of S. Matthew (who must have used the same source as S. Mark, if indeed he did not copy him) could have inserted them." Therefore the critics introduce an editor—wholly imaginary, remember—who, they declare, must have put these words into the mouth of the Lord; and thus our critics conclude that neither were they spoken by the Lord nor written by S. Matthew. Having then, in this easy way, disposed of the words that trouble them, they are able to declare that the writers of both Gospels are in independent agreement when they insert as their own comment, "Let him that readeth understand", and this, too, at the very same point of the narrative, and therefore that the discourse of the Lord in both Gospels must have originally been taken from another, and that, one common source.

But this introduces another question, Whence this other document to which the three Evangelists are indebted for their accounts? From whom did its author obtain the words of a discourse spoken in the hearing of no more than four persons?[1] Did all or any of these four furnish the report of

[1] "And as he sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately".—Mark. xiii. 3, R.V.

this discourse to the anonymous writer, for the anonymous book by which the critics who have discovered it are enabled to tell us of the twentieth century what parts of our Evangelists' report were spoken by the Lord, what parts written by those Evangelists, and what inserted in subsequent years by some unknown editor or editors by way of emendation?

Now we may appeal to common sense, and ask, Is this more likely or more reasonable than the time-honoured belief that the three Evangelists received the discourse at the mouth of some one or more of the four Apostles who alone heard it spoken? It is suggestive that four Apostles were selected by the Lord to listen to, and afterwards proclaim, this momentous prophecy, a prophecy telling of the sorrows of the Church, the last tribulation of the Chosen Race, the Parousia of the Lord, the Judgement of Gentiles. On the other occasions, of the raising of Jaïrus's daughter, of the glory of the Transfiguration, of the Agony in Gethsemane; there are but three selected witnesses (Peter, James, and John). But here the Lord adds Andrew, the brother of Peter, to the chosen three. May we here discern a Divine Providence forestalling the early removal of one of these witnesses, and providing for the contingency by the addition of one more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses His word should be established? It is also significant that the members of this little congregation are named by S. Mark alone of the three Evangelists—S. Mark, the son of that Mary to whose house the Apostle Peter came upon his miraculous deliverance from Herod's

prison, shortly after this tyrant had "killed James the brother of John with the sword."[1] It has always been the uncontradicted belief of the Church that in the Gospel of S. Mark S. Peter took a large share, and this naturally accounts for the report of the Lord's discourse in that Gospel. S. Matthew, although an Apostle, was not one of the four, did not hear the discourse spoken, and therefore stood on the same footing with S. Luke, both having to depend entirely upon the testimony of the men who heard. And we have no reason to doubt that, from one or all, each of these Evangelists did receive all that each reported of this momentous prophecy. And, if so, why the necessity for introducing an imaginary document to impart to these Evangelists information which they had already obtained at first hand?

If, then, such are the methods and such the results of the new criticism, it is small wonder that the evidence of the Evangelists should speedily fall into disfavour. What reliance can be placed on men supposed to be capable of thus fabricating their histories?

Yet is not this exactly the character which Dean Robinson would ascribe to the writer of our first Gospel when, having stated the reasons for attributing the preference to the second and third Gospels, he writes of the author of the first:—"He [the historian] cannot feel a like certainty from the historical point of view in dealing with statements which are only attested by the unknown writer of the first Gospel. He is bound to consider how far

[1] Acts xii. 2.

they may have been coloured and modified by his peculiar interest in the Old Testament, and by his life and surroundings in the early Christian Church."[1]

Language like this is surely a sufficient explanation of the fact that Christian apologists are exhibiting an unwarrantable hesitation, not found in former days, in appealing to the authority of the Gospels for the fact of the Resurrection of the Lord. Until the rise of this new school of critics none doubted that we had in the four Gospels an authentic and reliable, in fact the only, history of the life and death, the sayings and doings, of Jesus Christ. Every one accepted as fact that these four histories were first-hand recollections of those who lived and moved amid the events which they recorded; that the authors of two, if not three,[2] were men chosen by the Lord in His lifetime to be with him and to go forth to preach,[3] and after His resurrection ordained by Him to be His witnesses throughout the world.[4] But now, if we accept the new synoptic theory, it is not the personal recollections of these men that we possess, but only a transcript of another and prior gospel, which no mortal has ever seen. Yet more, in the case of the first Gospel, this first transcript, if such it be, was not made by the Apostle whose name it bears, S. Matthew had no hand in it whatever.[5] And as if this were not enough to shake the veracity and authenticity of the sacred

[1] J. Armitage Robinson, *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 101.
[2] That is, if S. Peter be taken as the instructor of S. Mark.
[3] Mark iii. 14.
[4] Acts i. 8.
[5] See W. C. Allen, *Gospel acc. to S. Matt.* (*Internat. Crit. Comm.*), Introd., p. lxxx.

history, we are introduced to a troop of hypothetical redactors or editors, without name or number, whose supposed additions and corrections have so altered the several transcripts as to render them absolutely worthless as historical evidence.

Now it is idle to assert, as it is asserted by some,[1] that the facts of the Lord's life, death, and resurrection, do not depend primarily upon the Gospels for their evidence, but rather upon the continuous tradition of the Christian society, and that the Gospels are only to be taken as the standard by which these traditions may be checked and corrected. For, what use is a standard to weigh or measure unless it be admitted by all parties as absolutely perfect for the use for which it was designed? And was it not for this end that, as I may say, all the resources of learning and talent have been expended, age after age, to establish and confirm our knowledge of the authors and dates and places whence come those sacred histories which are the one sure foundation, "the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture", Christ Jesus being the chief corner stone, "the foundation of the apostles and prophets", on which the whole fabric of the Church depends?[2] And it is this standard we must surrender if we accept and follow to its necessary conclusions the new theory of the Synoptic Gospels.

In saying this, I am far from supposing, far less hinting, that all who admire or advocate this or

[1] See *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 9, by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D.

[2] That is, "Laid by the Apostles", etc., Eph. ii. 20, where, see Ellicott.

that form of the theory adopt this conclusion. They shrink from the surrender of this old and tried standard; but it is this very dread alone that prevents them from following out the theory to its necessary and logical consequence. What this consequence is may clearly be seen in the two books, Professor Kirsopp Lake's *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ,* and the Rev. J. M. Thompson's *Miracles in the New Testament.* The perusal of these will be enough to show the alternatives between which the loyal believer in the revealed truth of God has to choose. And this choice becomes more imperative when we enter upon the history of the Resurrection of the Lord, where above all things it is necessary that the evidence should be clear and decisive.

For the sake of those unfamiliar with the details of the synoptic problem, I take another example to illustrate the vastness of the gulf which separates the new gospel of the critics from the old evangel of the Church.

In the first Gospel we are told of the appearance of an angel to the women who visited the tomb early on the Resurrection morning, and that he delivered to them a special message to be carried with all speed to the Apostles. Now, on the supposition that S. Matthew is the author of this Gospel, there ought to be no doubt as to the truth of the narrative which he records. He was himself an Apostle, one of those into whose ears the wonderful story of what they had seen and heard had been poured by these women, probably not many minutes after they had parted from the angel. Everything that we know

of this Apostle combines to commend him as one thoroughly qualified for the task of reporting what these women delivered. He was a business man, trained by the practice of an arduous profession to a keen observation of details, exercised too by the habit of committing these details to writing. As an official of the government, he would probably have some acquaintance with both its civil and military authorities, through whom, not improbably, he, and he alone of the Evangelists, obtained a first-hand acquaintance with the orders given for the guarding of the tomb, as well as with the events which followed. Moreover, as an intimate friend, possibly indeed a kinsman, of one or more of these women, he had opportunities of questioning and cross-examining them upon the event which they related, opportunities, we may be sure, of which a man of his character and habits would not be slow to make use. To the credibility of such an account, from such a man, supposing him to be the author of the narrative, it is impossible to refuse the most complete and cordial assent.

And now, let us hear the critics. First, they displace S. Matthew from the authorship of the Gospel. This, they say, was the work of a compiler writing some seventy, or perhaps one hundred years, or even later still, as some would have it, than the events he recorded; his materials, the floating traditions which had accumulated in the years that had passed. But even this has not resulted in the Gospel before us. Sundry editors, redactors, set to work at different times to correct, to alter, or amend, the compiler's work; and so, from the

hands of these unknown scribes, every one of them living after the events he related, has come down to us, if we believe the critics, the Gospel which the Church from the beginning has ever accepted as the Gospel of S. Matthew. But of what value can such a piece of work, manufactured by a process so haphazard, be as historical evidence to the Church of Christ? Of what use to decide questions of fact or to furnish reliable information as to the persons or places of which the record treats? None whatever. And yet it serves a purpose, it helps critics of the modern school to get rid of the miraculous and supernatural from what the Church has been accustomed to regard as an inspired narrative of much that is miraculous.

In the example which I have selected, as having an important bearing upon the history of the Resurrection, the "angel" of S. Matthew reveals to us the nature of the "young man" of S. Mark; the former tells us what he really was, S. Mark describes him under the form in which he appeared. But this is to bring in the superhuman element, exactly what the critics cannot away with. And so they welcome the study of the synoptic problem, which dissipates altogether the personal testimony of the women who saw and heard the angel and of the man who has delivered to us that testimony as taken from the lips of the women who gave it. Such is the result of the new criticism—shall we call it rather romanticism?—a barter of reasonable solid testimony for an empty array of baseless and fictitious legends. If, in this instance, even a shadow of real criticism were present, it would have

to, the learning and labour expended by Biblical scholars in the endeavour to prove the dependency of the first and third Gospels upon that of S. Mark and the unknown *Quelle*. But with all deference to these authorities, I cannot repress the conviction that another alternative has failed, unconsciously no doubt, to receive that attention and examination to which it is entitled, the alternative hypothesis, That the combination of agreements and disagreements in the several Gospels, on which scholars base their theory, is no other than might have been expected from three writers giving separate and independent narratives of the same events, which they severally record. Supporters of the theory of the synoptic problem have been, so it seems to me, pursuing their investigation of the Gospels with a view to establish this theory, which so fascinates them, rather than with a desire to see how far the peculiarities of each Gospel are conformable to the character and callings and habits and aims of each individual writer. Had this been considered, we should not have found critics of the negative school pronouncing hasty judgement upon S. Matthew's narrative of the watch for the sepulchre, granted by Pilate, as a mythical garnishing of the narrative in S. Mark, resting on no surer basis than some popular tradition. A more scientific criticism would rather have discerned a surer evidence for the Resurrection history in the fact that these incidents are recorded by the only one out of the four Evangelists whose position as a government official gave him the opportunity of acquiring a certain knowledge of

these particulars. S. Matthew's position as toll-gatherer under the Roman Government would assuredly have brought him into more or less intimate contact with the other officials, civil and military, with whom he served.[1]

Furthermore, there is room, I think, for even a closer attention than has yet been given, though I admit that has been great, to a comparison of the wording of the Synoptics. Many years ago, Dr. Salmon expressed his opinion that the verbal agreement, especially in the Passion history, between the first two Gospels went far to establish the fact that S. Matthew had "copied the narrative as we find it now in St. Mark."[2] But, that this verbal agreement is not always so close as Dr. Salmon implies, may be seen by any one who takes the trouble to make a comparison for himself. Thus, in the two accounts of the first visit to the tomb, given to us in these Gospels, we have the closest possible identity of facts. With the single exception of the mention of S. Peter in Mark, there is not the least difference in the smallest particular between the two Evangelists. It is, however, very different when we come to a verbal comparison of their narratives in the four verses in which each Evangelist respectively has comprised his account (Matthew xxxviii. 5-8; Mark xvi. 5-8). Take the Revisers' *Greek Text:* we have in Matthew seventy-three, and in Mark seventy-eight words. In these two narratives there are no fewer than sixty-five verbal differences; that is to say, in Matthew as

[1] Sir W. Ramsay, in Hastings's *Dict. of Bible*; see below, ch. v, p. 72 f.

[2] Salmon, *Introd. to the N.T.* (ninth ed.), p. 139.

differing from Mark; by addition, fourteen, by omission, twenty-eight, by alteration, twenty-three.

Now what does this enormous percentage of verbal differences indicate? Does it in the least imply that a copyist was here at work; unless, indeed, under the one condition that, though copying, the copyist desired that his work should not be known as a copy? But S. Matthew was no forger. As an Apostle who saw and heard the women reciting their wondrous story, he was no less able than S. Mark to write his own narrative of the occurrence. And this is the only rational solution of the problem, if problem there be, That each Evangelist heard the same story, of the same facts and words, told by the same women, at or about the same time, and recounted it afterwards, each in his own language. And the fact that both narratives are so essentially one in substance and particulars, and yet so diverse in words and phrases, is nothing less than a magnificent testimony to the absolute though independent truth of both Evangelists.[1]

In the following pages, then, I shall endeavour

[1] If my figures are correct in the above comparison of the two accounts of the visit of the women to the tomb, the conclusion, so far as this visit is concerned, must be different from that arrived at by Dr. Salmon regarding the narratives of the Passion given by these two Evangelists:—"The relation between the two Gospels [Matthew and Mark] becomes manifest if we compare that part of each in which they are in the closest agreement, namely, the history of the Passion. Thus the whole of Mark xv. is to be found in Matt. xxvii., and almost in identical words, but there are several passages in St. Matthew not to be found in St. Mark; and on examination I find no other explanation admissible than that St. Matthew copied the narrative as we find it now in St. Mark, interpolating in it different passages founded on knowledge derived from some other source."—*Introd. to the N.T.* (ninth ed.), p. 138 f.

to deal with the history of the Resurrection without discussing the various, and sometimes conflicting, questions involved in what is known as the Synoptic Problem. This much I have written to enable the reader who cares to accompany me to understand some of the difficulties that must be discussed as we proceed. Only I would make it clear to him that in examining the question of the empty tomb I am regarding the Evangelists, to whom we owe our knowledge of the entire history, as absolutely trustworthy historians, some of them actual eye-witnesses of what they record, all of them personally acquainted with most of the individuals who figure in their pages. And my endeavour will be to re-examine and restate the truth of their history in every detail. Notwithstanding the fierce light which sceptical criticism has brought to bear upon the history of the Resurrection in recent years, I may also be able to show that many errors alleged by critics, and too often unguardedly admitted by orthodox scholars, are nothing more than the mistakes and misinterpretations imposed by men upon the Truth of God. I would ask, in the words of a recent writer :—"Are the Scriptures really so inconsistent, or so vague, that a multitude of conflicting opinions and doctrines can be fairly deduced from them ? Were they so, the fact would, indeed, be a strong argument against their Divine origin. But we are by no means forced upon such an admission : nay, as soon as we begin to consider the enigma an obvious and certain solution presents itself. For not the revelation of God, but the expounders of that revelation, are responsible for the diversities of Christendom."[1]

[1] G. H. Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, p. 4.

CHAPTER IV.

CRUCIFIED AND DEAD.

"Ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay."—Acts ii. 23, R.V.

THAT each Evangelist differs from any or all of his companions in the number and variety of incidents that he has selected to depict the life and work of our Lord, is a fact known to the most superficial reader of the New Testament. As, for example, that while the first three Evangelists detail at considerable length the Lord's Galilæan ministry, S. John confines himself for the most part to His work in Judæa, on which they are silent, and takes little or no notice of that ministry in Galilee, which they relate so fully. Other examples in which the three Evangelists called the Synoptists[1] differ from, without contradicting, each other will easily occur to the careful reader; but what will most strike his attention is the ample detail in which all four Evangelists agree when they come to relate the Passion, Death, and Resurrection, of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this section of the Gospel history more than in any other will be found the great variety of incidents that differentiates the narrative

[1] "Because they give a common outline or synopsis of our Lord's work the first three Gospels are usually called the *Synoptic Gospels*."—L. Pullan, in Murray's *Bible Dict.*, art. *Gospels*, p. 316*b*.

of one Evangelist from another, according to the several characteristics of the writer or the aim and purpose of his work. And it is here that the presence of a guiding Spirit most impresses itself upon the mind of the reader, the more he compares the number and variety of differences with the absolute absence of contradiction between any two of the records. This will, I think, be speedily apparent when we begin our study of the events of the Resurrection morning.

To do this, it will be sufficient to take up the history at the last stage in the sufferings of our Blessed Lord. This much is necessary, if only for the obvious reason that the certainty of His Resurrection depends upon the certainty of His death. And that to prove this latter was the aim of each of the inspired writers will, I think, presently appear. For in studying the incidents which they have recorded as immediately preceding His death, we can hardly escape the conviction that one common design is present in the four histories, To emphasize the clear and vigorous exercise of His faculties possessed by our Lord up to the very moment of His death. Let us, then, see how this is borne out by the brief history to which I now call the reader's attention.

A mysterious pall of darkness, according to the Synoptists, had rested for three hours, from midday till three o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, upon the Holy City and all the land. Of this period Holy Scripture records no incident whatever. That it was mysterious and supernatural, enforcing a solemn awe and silence upon all, may be

gathered from the fact of its mention by three Evangelists.[1] But what this three hours' silence and darkness meant to the Lord Himself appears from the declaration of the first two Evangelists that, at or about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice saying, "My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?"[2] Observe that I adopt the marginal rendering of the Revisers, "Why didst thou forsake me?", as the exact translation of the Greek of the two Evangelists, instead of "Why hast thou forsaken me?" of the Authorized Version. The change is one of great significance. For, as the "Why hast thou forsaken me?" implies that the Lord was still experiencing the desertion of the Father when He uttered the words, the rendering of the Revisers' margin, "Why didst thou forsake me?", implies that what He had been experiencing had now become a thing of the past.[3] And as the "loud voice" betokened the sudden and intense relief experienced by His human nature at the passing of the awful agony of separation, His "My God, my God" indicates not only His un-

[1] That an eclipse was not intended, even by the words of S. Luke ("the sun failing", R.V., marg.) is evident from the fact that "at passover" the moon was full. See *Speaker's Comm.*, on Matt. xxvii. 45; and Hastings's *Dict. of Bible*, vol. i, p. 560*a*.

[2] Mark xv. 34, R.V., marg.; Matt. xxvii. 46, R.V., marg.

[3] "The whole is 'not so much a cry of anguish, as rather a testimony that He had broken through into a freedom becoming to His mediatorial office.'"—Rieger, in Stier, *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, vol. vii, p. 486.

"*Hast thou forsaken*—Past tense. In that very moment the abandonment ended, as the Passion itself did immediately after. In the midst, and at the height of the abandonment, he had been silent. The abandonment is the only thing of which he complains."—Bengel, *Gnomon of N.T.*, Matt. xxvii. 46.

broken faith, but is also the expression of a loving thankfulness upon the termination of the trial.[1]

Now here I must anticipate a question that may arise in the minds of my readers, How may we account for the silence both of S. Luke and of S. John as regards this tremendous utterance?—to be distinguished, by the way, from the "loud voice" which immediately preceded Christ's death.

It is not unfair to assume that the first two Evangelists were themselves eyewitnesses of the events they record.[2] It is more probable than not that they were among all the acquaintances who stood afar off at the Crucifixion.[3] What S. Luke, however, relates, he relates not as an eyewitness himself, but as one who had carefully verified his facts, as he tells us, by inquiry of those who were most competent to testify to their truth.

[1] "This is the only one of the 'seven words' which is reported by Matthew and Mark." "Most exactly given by Mark in the vernacular Syro-Chaldaic dialect, Eloi, Eloi, etc."—Lange, *Comm. on the N. T.*, on S. Matt. xxvii. 46.

[2] What authority has Mr. Thompson (*Miracles in the N. T.*, p. 173) for stating that "none of the disciples were present" at the crucifixion? As Dr. Sparrow Simpson truly says:—"The message sent to the disciples, 'He goeth *before* you into Galilee,' implies the presence of the disciples also in Jersualem on that day. Accordingly the theory that 'they all left Him and fled' means fled direct home to Galilee, is refuted by the implications of the earliest Evangelist. S. Mark knows nothing of a flight of the apostles before Easter to Galilee. The Apocryphal Gospel of Peter takes a similar line. The apostles, if we may credit S. Mark, were still residing in the Holy City."—W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 64.

See also Prof. Orr (*The Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 214 f.), who gives the reasons why critics so fervently desire the transference of the Resurrection Appearances to Galilee.

[3] See Luke xxiii. 49.

Take S. Matthew's account, not materially different from that of S. Mark :—

"And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken [marg., didst thou forsake] me? And some of them that stood there, when they heard it, said, This man calleth Elijah. And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. And the rest said, Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him. And Jesus cried again with a loud voice, and yielded up his spirit. And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake; and the rocks were rent; and the tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many." [1]

Of the incidents included in this passage, S. Luke only retains: the rending of the veil, the last loud cry, and the giving up of the ghost. Now, when it is remembered that S. Luke was writing for Gentile readers, unlearned in the Hebrew or Aramaic tongue, we can easily understand why he would be likely to omit an incident that arose altogether out of a misapprehension of the Lord's utterance, in Hebrew or Aramaic, of a verse of a Hebrew Psalm, the utterance of which suggested to the bystanders that the Lord was calling for Elijah.

This, then, I think, sufficiently accounts for

[1] Matt. xxvii. 46–53, R.V.

S. Luke's omission of our Lord's cry in the words of the twenty-second Psalm and the incident to which it gave rise. It will also, further, explain the difference between the confession of the Centurion as given by S. Luke and that given by S. Matthew: "Certainly this was a righteous man"[1], instead of S. Matthew's, "Truly this was the Son of God."[2] The Hebrew expression, "Son of God", at once conveys to Matthew's Jewish readers the conviction wrought upon the mind of the Centurion by the "loud cry" of the dying Christ. The same conviction is expressed to S. Luke's Gentile readers, to whom "Son of God" would be unintelligible, by "a righteous man."[3] Upon this we may accept the opinion of Dean Alford as the true interpretation of these words: "Luke has not so exactly expressed the words."

"They only give the *general sense* of the persuasion of the centurion. Truly, this man was innocent:—and if innocent (nay, more, δίκαιος [*dikaios*] just, truthful) He *was the Son of God, for He had asserted it.*"

If the conjecture may be allowed, that S. Mark was himself a near spectator of the sufferings of Christ, it will fully account for the very remarkable words in which he relates the effect of our Lord's cry upon the Centurion:—"When the centurion which stood over against him, saw that he so cried

[1] Luke xxiii. 47. [2] Matt. xxvii. 54.

[3] "The insignificant variations in the different accounts, partly in regard to the words employed by the centurion, partly in relation to the genesis of the judgment he expressed, tend to vouch for their historical truth rather than the opposite."—F. L. Steinmeyer, *The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 197.

out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God." [1] It is much to be regretted that the Revisers have committed so grievous an outrage upon the Sacred Text by their excision of the word (κράξας, *kraxas*) rendered in the Authorized Version by "cried out, and", inasmuch as its loss deprives us of the testimony of the Centurion to the miraculous nature of the Lord's death.

The following extracts from Dean Burgon's *The Revision Revised* (pp. 71-2) will enable the reader to judge of the wantonness of the offence:—"The first three Evangelists are careful to note 'the *loud* cry' with which the Redeemer of the World expired. But it was reserved for S. Mark (as Chrysostom pointed out long since) to record (xv. 39) the memorable circumstance that *this particular portent* it was, which wrought conviction in the soul of the Roman soldier whose office it was to be present on that terrible occasion. The man had often witnessed death by Crucifixion, and must have been well acquainted with its ordinary phenomena. Never before had he witnessed anything like this. He was stationed where he could see and hear all that happened: 'standing' (S. Mark says) 'near' our SAVIOUR—'over against Him.' 'Now, when the Centurion saw that it was *after so* crying out (κράξας), that He expired' (xv. 39) he uttered the memorable words, 'Truly this man *was* the SON OF GOD!' 'What chiefly moved him to make that confession of his faith was that our SAVIOUR evidently died *with power*.' 'The miracle' (says Bp. Pearson) 'was not in the death,

[1] Mark xv. 39, A.V.

but *in the voice.* The strangeness was not that He should die, but that at the point of death He should *cry out so loud.* He died not by, but with a miracle.' . . . All this however is lost in ℵ B L, which literally *stand alone* in leaving out the central and only important word, κράξας. Calamitous to relate, they are followed herein by our Revisionists: who (misled by Dr. Hort) invite us henceforth to read,—'Now when the Centurion saw *that He so gave up the ghost.*'"

Reading S. Matthew's account of our Lord's cry from the cross, in which he is closely followed by S. Mark, the question is apt to face us, What could our Lord's words, "Eli, Eli lama sabachthani?" have in them to cause the bystanders to fill a sponge with vinegar, put it on a reed, and set it to His lips? The answer, hardly discoverable in the accounts of S. Matthew and S. Mark, easily appears when we read in S. John another word, uttered immediately after this one, when Jesus said Διψῶ (*dipsō*), "*I thirst.*" This explains, perhaps too, corrects, our notion of the conduct of the soldier who so quickly and sympathetically responded to the cry of the sufferer. But if this completes the accounts of S. Matthew and S. Mark, it immediately raises another question, with regard to the silence of S. John as to the incidents that they relate.

S. John says nothing of the darkness; nothing of the anguished appeal of the Lord; nothing of the rent veil, the earthquake, the opened graves. All this omission may be explained, as it often has been, by the fact that S. John, writing his Gospel so long after the others, did not think it necessary

to recapitulate what his predecessors had already noticed. This may indeed be true; yet still there are two other explanations, which ought not to be left out of account in dealing with this portion of the Gospel History.

(1) Twice S. John emphatically claims to be an eyewitness of the facts that he records. Relating the piercing of the Lord's side by the spear of the soldier, he declares:—"He that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." [1] And again, when closing his Gospel, he, as it were, puts his seal to it in these words:—"This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true." [2]

Remembering these words, naturally we expect to find in his history of the Crucifixion the details of those incidents which he himself beheld. Were it otherwise, were facts related other than those coming under his own notice, occasion might be given to question the truth of his own claim. Now, observe where and why this Apostle takes up his narrative of the last moments of the Crucifixion. Some little time before noon—how much or how little before, we cannot say—he had received, as the Lord's dying

[1] John xix. 35, R.V.

[2] John xxi. 24, R.V. Some critics are of opinion that chapter xxi is not the work of S. John, but of some later hand. But the force of the argument is not diminished should this verse be taken to be the work of another hand and not, as I prefer to take it, as the w rk of the Apostle himself. In the former case, it actually would furnish additional proof that the Apostle was a faithful narrator of the things that he himself had witnessed.

charge, the care of His mother; when, to use S. John's own words: "And from that hour the disciple took her unto his own home."[1] Three o'clock had come, the supernatural darkness of that afternoon was passing away, the Lord's words "My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?" had broken the silence and the darkness, and apparently "the disciple" had not yet returned from his sorrowful journey. And not till the moment of that return is the course of his history resumed. That moment appears to be just as the word Διψῶ (*dipsō*), "*I thirst*", falls from the sacred lips; when, from this on, every incident is crowded upon the page, as by the pen of one who would not let one single detail of the last moments of his dying Lord escape his memory. The hyssop and the bowl are noticed, the Lord's acceptance of the vinegar; the word of consummation, "It is finished"; the bowed head; the delivering up of the spirit: all these come from the hand of the beloved Apostle and from him alone.

(2) But there is another matter, which must be taken into account, in explaining why S. John has preserved certain events connected with the Crucifixion that the other Evangelists omit. S. John appears to have a certain design in tracing the events of this period. He not only keeps his mind upon the sequence of events, but marks each one of these as the fulfilment of what was spoken by the prophets of old time. Thus when the word Διψῶ (*dipsō*), "I thirst", falls upon his ear, he treasures it up for fuller light, which indeed may

[1] John xix. 27, R.V.

have been imparted to him subsequently by the Lord Himself. The words with which he introduces this incident are strikingly suggestive :—" After this Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be accomplished, saith, I thirst." [1] How did S. John know the mind of Christ on this point, that Christ *knew that all was finished*, and that Christ uttered the word, " I thirst " in order " that the scripture might be accomplished " ? Surely he is not here writing as the author of a religious fiction ; rather, as a faithful and true witness, he records what he must have received from the mouth of the Lord Himself ; Christ Himself told it to S. John. How suggestive to us of precious intervals of communion that the beloved disciple must have enjoyed during the forty days when the Lord was committing to His Apostles those precepts that were to actuate their life and rule their conduct when He should have parted from them for the last time.

Thus the record of the Evangelists, preserving, as it does, the independence of each writer, not only in variety of expression but also in the selection of incidents, exhibits at the same time a unity of testimony to the great fact that up to the last moment of His life our Blessed Lord remained in full and clear possession of all His faculties ; in other words, that in His case death was a miracle. Without any design or premeditation all four Evangelists witness to the fulfilment of the Lord's own prediction : " I lay down my life, that I may take

[1] John xix. 28, R.V.

it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself." [1]

All this is still further accentuated in the words with which each Evangelist closes his record of the Lord's death. The three Synoptists all agree in recording the "loud voice" with which the Lord surrendered His life; yet each one of the three employs a different verb in his record. S. Matthew writes: "Jesus cried", κράξας (*kraxas*); S. Mark: "uttered", ἀφεὶς (*apheis*); S. Luke: "cried", φωνήσας (*phōnēsas*): all this indicating a perfect independence of the narrators, without the slightest trace of contradiction. Each is intent only on preserving the record of the loud cry (not the "deep expiring groan", the hymnist's unscriptural interpretation) that proved the Saviour's death to be unique among the thousands who ever suffered death by crucifixion. It was, as Bengel writes, "a voluntary surrender of life. The torture of the Crucifixion inflicted on Him by men did not terminate His life." [2]

The same is to be observed of the final word employed by each to declare the Lord's death. S. Matthew writes: He "yielded up his spirit", ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα (*aphēke to pneuma*); S. Mark and S. Luke: He "gave up the ghost", ἐξέπνευσε (*exepneuse*); S. John: "gave up his spirit", παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα (*paredōke to pneuma*)—one and the same fact, the self-surrender of His spirit by Christ, testified to by all four Evangelists, though three different phrases are employed to convey this one great fact.

[1] John x. 17, 18, R.V. Observe "no one", not "no man", as in A.V. Neither man, nor Satan, nor demon, could take it.

[2] *Gnomon of N.T.*, Matt. xxvii. 50.

CHAPTER V.

AND BURIED.

"They took him down from the tree, and laid him in a tomb."—Acts xiii. 29, R.V.

In the record of the burial of our Lord, upon which the Evangelists next enter with some detail, the fact which probably first arrests our attention is the number and variety of the figures who are made to pass before us: Pontius Pilate; the Centurion; Joseph of Arimathæa; Nicodemus,who at the first came to Jesus by night; Mary Magdalene; Mary the wife of Clopas and mother of James and Joses; six in all, not to speak of the Jews who asked of Pilate that the bodies of the crucified might be taken away, or of the chief priests and the Pharisees who asked Pilate to secure the tomb, or of the guard posted before the stone. So many figures on so small a canvas make the possibility of indistinctness, or even error, very great indeed. Negative criticism has eagerly seized upon this possibility, and endeavours to prove, from certain supposed discrepancies, that the Gospel Narrative is a collection of traditional figments rather than a true historical record.

The record opens with the application of the Jews to Pilate that the legs of the crucified might be broken in order that the bodies might be removed

before the beginning of the Sabbath, "for the day of that sabbath was a high day." [1]

It is hard to understand why critics should have recourse to a supposed later tradition to explain the omission of this circumstance by the Synoptists and its preservation by S. John, rather than accept the simple and natural explanation, that S. John here writes what he himself saw and knew. And that he does so, in no way implies that the Synoptists, while omitting, were ignorant of the incident.

S. John must have been still standing by the cross when the soldiers proceeded to execute Pilate's order; probably he knew beforehand that the Jewish leaders had gone to Pilate to seek the removal of the bodies; we have a hint given us already of his intimacy with the servants of the High Priest. He knows the name of the servant, Malchus, whose ear Peter cut off [2]; he was even known unto the High Priest himself, and by this means obtained admission for Peter into the High Priest's house.[3] He, and he only of the Evangelists, appears to have been acquainted with Nicodemus, whom he mentions three times in his Gospel. What then more natural and easy than that S. John alone of the four Evangelists should preserve the memory of an incident peculiarly his own? Besides this, there is another reason why this Apostle should record this application of the Jews to Pilate, because this led directly to the accomplishment of two Messianic predictions of the Old Testament Scriptures. It has already been seen how carefully this Evangelist, in the two

[1] John xix. 31, R.V. [2] John xviii. 10. [3] John xviii. 15, 16.

words from the cross, "I thirst" and "It is finished", has noted that the Scriptures were fulfilled; and so, here again, this application of the Jews which he relates leads to the fulfilment of two other prophecies, which he is careful to note: "A bone of him shall not be broken" [1] and "They shall look on him whom they pierced." [2] All this falls in naturally with the aim and plan of his Gospel.

This appeal of the Jews was speedily followed by another of a very different character. Joseph of Arimathæa—a rich man and a disciple of Jesus (Matthew); "a councillor of honourable estate, who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God" (Mark); "a councillor, a good man and a righteous" who "had not consented to their counsel and deed", "who was looking for the kingdom of God" (Luke); "a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews" (John)—"boldly went in unto Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus" (Mark). According to S. Mark, "Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. And when he learned it of the centurion, he granted the corpse[3] to Joseph." "Pilate gave him leave" (John), and "commanded it to be given up" (Matthew).

[1] John xix. 36. [2] John xix. 37.

[3] "Corpse", so Greek text and the translation of Revisers, and rightly. The three other Evangelists use σῶμα (*sōma, body*), which also has been adopted in the Received Text here, as more reverent. But S. Mark, according to leading MSS., as so often with him, for greater vividness gives the word probably used by Pilate, πτῶμα, *ptōma, corpse*, indicating his contempt. See Swete, *The Gospel acc. to S. Mark*, xv. 45.

Now, by the ordinary mind, this remarkable diversity of epithets and expressions would be at once taken as a decisive indication of independence of statement by the several writers. Not so, however, by the modern critics. By them all differences are held to be discrepancies, all diversities are held to be contrarieties. To common sense it would appear easier to accept these differences as not contradictory, and to account for them by the respective knowledge and predilection of the several writers, than to invent an arbitrary and uncertain tradition to which we may suppose them to have had recourse. On this latter hypothesis it would be a waste of time to attempt a reply to the so-called arguments founded upon these differences; but there are one or two unmistakable misconceptions of Scripture to which I would like to call attention.

Mr. Thompson, the latest exponent in England of the modern criticism, tells us that the words, "he had not consented to their counsel and deed", in Luke xxiii. 51, were probably "An editorial note to explain how Joseph, being a member of the Sanhedrin, could yet have acted as he did. It contradicts Mk. xiv. 64, which states that the verdict was unanimous, and there is no reason to suppose that it rests on independent information." [1]

But are we so certain that S. Luke's words have any reference to the meeting of the Sanhedrin described by S. Mark? Let it be remembered that the Evangelists report two separate trials of our Lord by the High Priest and the Jewish

[1] J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the N. T.*, p. 184.

Council; one of these being held in the night, immediately upon His arrest; and the other, in the morning, before the departure of the chief priests with the elders and scribes and the whole Council for the palace of Pilate. The reports of the former include the interrogation of Christ by the High Priest [1] Annas, the examination of the false witnesses, and the adjuration of the Lord by Caiaphas, upon which "they all condemned him to be worthy of death." This appears to have closed the night trial, when the Sanhedrists who attended it dispersed. This may possibly be indicated by S. Mark's expression: "The officers received him with blows of their hands", introduced into the reports (contained in all the Synoptists) of the mocking and buffeting, spitting upon and reviling of the Lord, which probably continued till daybreak.

"And as soon as it was day," writes S. Luke, "the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council" (*συνέδριον sunedrion*).[2]

[1] This is recorded only by S. John, xviii 12–24, R.V. The aorist of verse 24 as rendered in R.V. ("Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas, the high priest") seems to require us to interpret "high priest" in the foregoing verses (15, 16, 19, 22) of Annas, rather than of Caiaphas, who was actually the High Priest. See Westcott, and especially Meyer, *Comm., in loc.* No difficulty need be felt in the application of the title, "the high priest" (*ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, ho archiereus*), to Annas. There were many ex-high-priests in the time of our Lord. In Luke iii. 2, we read: "Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests", or, R.V.: "In the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas." See Schürer, *Jewish People*, Div. II, vol. i, p. 182 (Eng. tr

[2] Luke xxii. 66, R.V.

Allow me here to digress for a moment to say that I take the verses which follow this verse (Luke xxii. 67-71) as describing an incident of the morning sitting of the Council rather than what had occurred overnight. In their over-eagerness to harmonize, commentators are too fond of taking liberties with the Sacred Writers, presuming to improve or correct what, with no adequate data, they imagine to be an error or transposition on the part of the writer. Here it needs but a little study to show that S. Luke's account of the examination of our Lord by the Council in the morning is wholly different from that carried on at the night meeting by the High Priest, as related by S. Matthew and S. Mark. As related by them,[1] the address of the High Priest to our Lord follows immediately upon the breakdown of the false witnesses. It is a most solemn adjuration to Christ after the Law of Moses : " Tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God." The Lord assents, adding a prediction of His future coming with power, upon which the High Priest rends His clothes, pronounces Christ to have spoken blasphemy, and puts the question to the Council : " What think ye ? They answered and said, He is worthy of death." There is no substantial disagreement here between S. Matthew and S. Mark.

Now compare what S. Luke writes.[2] His incident opens with the statement that it took place after dawn, " as soon as it was day ", therefore it is not identical with the examination recorded by

[1] Matt. xxvi. 57–66 ; Mark xiv. 53–64.
[2] Luke xxii. 66–71.

the first two Evangelists as taking place immediately upon the arrest of Jesus in the garden. The chief priests and the scribes are the interlocutors throughout the whole scene. Caiaphas is not mentioned. The assembly—not the High Priest—demands: "If thou art the Christ, tell us." The Lord answers—not as He responded to the High Priest's Mosaic adjuration, but deprecatingly: "If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer", after which follows the prediction of His future coming. This evokes from the assembly—not from the High Priest—the question, not the solemn adjuration but the simple question: "Art thou then the Son of God?" To which the Lord returns: "Ye say that I am." The incident concludes—not with the rending of clothes, the accusation of blasphemy, nor the demand of the High Priest—but with the pronouncement: "What further need have we of witness?"

Thus the differences are too many and too marked to allow of an identity between the two incidents. And whatever coincidence between them may appear is sufficiently accounted for by the circumstances. What the High Priest had failed to obtain by means of the false witnesses overnight, the Sanhedrin in the morning thought to secure by the confession of the Lord Himself, and so enable them to declare to Pilate: "He made himself the Son of God" (John xix. 7).

To return, the words of the first two Evangelists, in their mention of the morning Council, are very significant. S. Matthew writes:—"Now when morning was come, all the chief priests and the elders

of the people took counsel [*συμβούλιον, sumboulion*] against Jesus to put him to death : and they bound him, and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor." [1] S. Mark's words are :— " And straightway in the morning the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation [*συμβούλιον, sumboulion*], and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate." [2]

Now, is it necessary to do more than read the descriptions of these two meetings—night and morning—to discover a difference in their objects, and to see to which S. Luke refers when he tells us that Joseph " had not consented to their counsel [*βουλῇ, boulē*] and deed " ? [3] At night, the effort was solely to prove the Lord guilty of blasphemy because He had made Himself the Son of God. In the morning, they *took counsel* how the penalty of this blasphemy—that is, His death—might be secured by appeal to the Roman Procurator, who, and not the Jews, held this power in his hands. The humblest reader, as easily and truly as the most erudite scholar, sees at a glance that the " counsel " (*βουλή, boulē*) was the Council of the chief priests and scribes when they took counsel against Jesus, and that the " deed " was when " they bound him, and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor." He sees that S. Luke's words " counsel and deed " can have no reference to the night sitting, at which, S. Mark tells us, " all condemned him to be worthy of death " ;

[1] Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, R.V. [2] Mark xv. 1, R.V.
[3] Luke xxiii. 51, R.V.

but must refer to the meeting of the morning, when alone the consultation really took place ; and thus, so far from contradicting his brother Evangelist, S. Luke is here discovered to be, as so frequently, a writer of the minutest accuracy.

What then is the conclusion at which we arrive ? This, undoubtedly, That it is the critic and not the Evangelist whom we find to be in error. It is the critic who confounds the nocturnal synod of the first two Evangelists with the morning consultation described at length by S. Luke alone. It is the critic who forgets that it was of the nocturnal sitting S. Mark speaks when he declares : " They all condemned him to be worthy of death." And it is the critic who appears not to know that it is of the result of the morning sitting that S. Luke writes when he states that Joseph " had not consented to their counsel and deed." Whether present or not at this morning consultation, S. Luke does not say ; but in either case, S. Luke is wholly uncontradicted by any one of the three other Evangelists when he declares that Joseph had not agreed to the " counsel " of the Sanhedrin that delivered Christ to Pilate, nor yet to the " deed " of " the chief priests and the rulers and the people " [1] when they shouted " Crucify, crucify him ", and Pilate " delivered up to their will " Him in whom neither he nor Herod had found anything worthy of death.

But what of the criticism which ignores such Biblical study, or pursues it only in the endeavour to discover some disturbing error in an inspired writer of the Sacred Books, a criticism which invents

[1] Luke xxiii. 13, R.V.

a tradition to account for blunders thought to be discovered, but is blind to the fact that these are blunders of its own creation, without any foundation whatever in the written Word? Surely, it is only an undiscerning and unthinking multitude that takes such criticism to be an interpretation of the Word of God.

But a criticism yet more reprehensible awaits us as we proceed. S. John mentions a second personage associated with Joseph in the burial of our Lord:—"There came also Nicodemus, he who at the first came to him by night, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pound weight."[1] This introduction of Nicodemus is not agreeable to the new critics. Nicodemus must be got rid of. But how? Mr. Thompson informs us:—"Nicodemus in the fourth Gospel is the typical 'secret disciple,' being, perhaps, an imaginary character based on the Joseph of the Synoptic Gospels. And one cannot help thinking that, instead of substituting him in the present passage for Joseph, as he might have done, John may have preferred to keep both names. Nothing is said in Mk. of any disciple besides Joseph being present. The hurry and secrecy of the work make it unlikely."[2]

What are we to say to this extraordinary criticism?—scientific, we cannot call it. That it should be John, and not Mark or another of the Synoptists, to mention Nicodemus is most natural, since it is John who specially concerns himself with the work of the Lord in Jerusalem and Judæa.

[1] John xix. 39, R.V.

[2] J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the N. T.*, p. 187.

Whether he had greater opportunities than the other Apostles for becoming acquainted with this Judæan ministry, we cannot say. But the fact remains that it is he who narrates it, narrates it, too, as one personally acquainted with it, narrates circumstances connected with Judæan persons and places unnoticed by the other Evangelists. He is acquainted with the High Priest, familiar with his household, and therefore the only one of the Apostles of whom we may say that he might, not improbably, have known other members of the Sanhedrin. Hence, the mention of Nicodemus in his Gospel is neither unnatural nor improbable. The very incidental way in which Nicodemus is mentioned in the three places where his name occurs makes this more probable. And has anything been found in S. John's Gospel that ought to make us regard him, even in the slightest degree, as untrustworthy? Has anything been there discovered of which it might be said that it was false or incredible? Has any contemporary writing been discovered which even hints that John is untrustworthy? Or, has any writer of any age cast doubt upon the genuineness of any one of the three passages in which Nicodemus is named? And yet, in default of the smallest tittle of such evidence, we are asked by this modern critic to look upon Nicodemus as a myth, a creature of fiction who never existed; and what the beloved and inspired Apostle of the Lord has written as history, we must now regard as no more credible than the page of a modern novel!

And what is the end of this baseless criticism?

Nothing more nor less than this, To show us that S. John could not have penned his record of the burial of the Lord without having S. Mark's Gospel before him, nor, having this, without adding something of the floating traditions that had grown up between the death of Christ and the writing of the Gospel; and one of these figments, we are told, was Nicodemus![1] Surely we may substitute a little common sense for such criticism. Are we to suppose that the loving disciple, "whom Jesus loved", standing beside the cross beholding, perhaps himself assisting, the reverent removal of the body of his beloved Lord from the cross, could ever have forgotten the persons, the offices, the names, the acts, the gestures, of those well-remembered disciples, Joseph and Nicodemus, who drew forth the nails, took down the body, and prepared it for the tomb? What tradition could any man need, least of all the Apostle John, to furnish or correct the memory of an event so ever memorable?[2]

Nicodemus provided the spices, an hundred pound weight. What matters it that the Evangelist tells

[1] K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 175 f.

[2] The following remarks of Bishop Lightfoot as to Irenaeus's recollections of Polycarp are here so pertinent that I may be excused for quoting them:—"Those who have listened to a Sedgwick after a lapse of sixty or seventy years repeating anecdotes of the 'statesmen' in his native dale, or describing the circumstances under which he first heard the news of the battle of Trafalgar, will be able to realize the vividness of the stories which the aged Polycarp would tell to his youthful pupil of his intercourse with the last surviving Apostle—the memory of the narrator being quickened and the interest of the hearer intensified, in this case, by the conviction that they were brought face to face with facts such as the world had never seen before."—*Essays on Supernat. Rel.*, p. 99.

us nothing of the how or when or where these were procured? The Evangelist's silence does not, as the critics think, make the fact impossible. Only let us observe that these spices were not unguents; they were dry and pounded and mixed, shaken into the cloths that wrapped the sacred body. There was no anointing, neither was there embalming, on this Friday evening. The critics say there was. Not one of the four Evangelists says a word of either. The two disciples wrapped the sacred body in the new linen cloth[1] (*σινδών, sindōn*) and other cloths[2] (*ὀθόνια, othonia*), and together laid it in Joseph's new tomb hewn out of the rock, in which no man had ever yet been laid.

I must not pass on without noticing what appears to modern critics as a remarkable discovery. In S. Luke's apparently innocent expression: "In a tomb that was hewn in stone", they conceive that the Evangelist had adopted a tradition subsequent to S. Mark's Gospel, and therefore changed S. Mark's words: "In a tomb which had been hewn out of a rock" (*ἐν μνημείῳ, ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, en mnēmeiō, ho ēn lelatomēmenon ek petras*) into "in a tomb that was hewn in stone" (*ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ, en mnēmati laxeutō*). By this change, they fancy that S. Luke intended to tell us that the receptacle for our Lord's body was a tomb built up of quarried stones, and therefore contradicts S. Mark, who describes it as a sepulchre hewn out in the side of a cliff. The discovery, however, is not new. Salmasius, a very learned but somewhat "arrogant and pretentious" scholar, who shows great care-

[1] Matt. xxvii. 59. [2] John xix. 40, R.V.

lessness in the statement of facts, made this same assertion so far back as the early half of the seventeenth century. Bishop Pearson tells us: "Salmasius hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art, of stone, within it." I must refer the reader to the Bishop's learned and interesting note for a sufficient answer to those critics who have revived the invention of Salmasius,[1] an invention dismissed by Meyer with contemptuous brevity:—"λαξευτῷ [*laxeutō̄*] *hewn in stone* (Deut. iv. 49), therefore neither dug nor built."[2]

There is another feature in the description of this tomb which ought not to be passed over, in view of the doubts cast by recent critics upon the identification, by the women on the Resurrection morning, of the tomb where Christ was laid. S. Matthew tells us that Joseph laid the body "in his own new tomb."[3] S. Luke describes it as a tomb "where never man had yet lain."[4] And

[1] Pearson, *On the Creed*, Art. *And Buried*, p. 322, note.

[2] *Comm. on S. Luke*, xxiii. 53.

Professor K. Lake (*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 51) thinks that his theory is supported by a varient reading found only in the Codex Bezae where S. Mark's λελατομένω (*lelatomenō̄*), "cut out", is substituted for the λαξεύτω (*laxeutō̄*), "hewn in stone", of S. Luke. Dr. Lake supposes that the redactor who made this change did so because he imagined that S. Luke's *edifice of stone* (as he thought S. Luke called it) was a contradiction of S. Mark's *cave in the rock*. But is it not just as reasonable to infer that this imaginary redactor made the change because he thought no difference was intended by S. Luke in his use of "hewn in stone", and that therefore he might without harm substitute Mark's better known "cut out"?

[3] Matt. xxvii. 60: ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ (*en tō̄ kainō̄ autou mnēmeiō̄*). [4] Luke xxiii. 53, R.V.

S. John, combining the descriptions of the first and third Evangelists, tells us that in the garden was " a new tomb wherein was never man yet laid." [1] These marks would preclude, one might suppose, the possibility of any mistake on the part of the women when they came on Sunday morning to inspect the tomb and anoint the body of the Lord. The tomb itself was not a natural cave, but cut out of the face of the cliff which stood in a garden hard by the spot where the Crucifixion had taken place. It was the private property of Joseph, a new tomb in which no body had ever before been laid. Whether other sepulchres, natural caves or tombs like this hewn out of the rock, stood anywhere near, we are not told, nor have we any means of knowing ; though it is assumed by critics, perhaps admitted also by most writers, why, I know not, that other tombs were to be found adjacent. Whether, however, this were so or not, the distinguishing marks given in the Gospel narratives are so many and so pronounced as to render it all but impossible for any of the dozen or more persons who, we are told, visited the spot on the morning of the Resurrection to mistake the identical tomb in which the body of the Lord had been laid. At any rate, they sufficiently answer the fanciful imaginings of Professor K. Lake, when he says :—" The women came in the early morning to a tomb which they thought was the one in which they had seen the Lord buried. They expected to find a closed tomb, but they found an open one ; and a young man, who was in the

[1] John xix. 41, R.V. : "A new tomb", μνημεῖον καινόν (*mnēmeion kainon*).

entrance, guessing their errand, tried to tell them that they had made a mistake in the place. 'He is not here,' said he; 'see the place where they laid him,' and probably pointed to the next tomb." [1]!

And now, the Lord's body being reverently laid within this sepulchre, the Sabbath was fast drawing nigh. With the Jew this began at sundown on the Friday, and in order to prepare for it the crowds were already returning from the awful spectacle they had witnessed to their homes within or around the city. S. Luke fixes our attention on one such group of spectators:—"It was the day of the Preparation, and the sabbath drew on. And the women, which had come with him out of Galilee, followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments. And on the sabbath they rested according to the commandment." [2] This Evangelist then proceeds to follow the movements of these women on the morning of the first day of the week, the first Easter Day. He relates their visit to the sepulchre, where they meet with two angels who told them of Christ's Resurrection, upon which they returned "and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest." [3]

The words which immediately follow this, as they stand in the Revised Version, are very remarkable, and not altogether clear as to their reference. I ask the reader's special attention to them:—"Now

[1] K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 251–2.
[2] Luke xxiii. 54–6, R V. [3] Luke xxiv. 9, R.V.

they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles." If we understand "The other women" who told their experiences to the Eleven to be these women who had met the two angels at the sepulchre, what are we to understand by the expression "Now they were", used of the three women whom he mentions by name? Does S. Luke mean they were *beholding the tomb*, as in xxiii. 55, or, were they also visitors to the sepulchre on the first day of the week? However we understand it, they clearly appear to be distinguished by S. Luke from "the other women" who "told these things unto the apostles." Whatever be the interpretation put upon this verse, the verse itself is a direct contradiction of Professor K. Lake's statement:—"Luke omits all mention of the names of the women."[1] This verse enables us to give a flat denial to the statement and to say, S. Luke does nothing of the kind; he gives even a fuller list of names than either of the other Evangelists. I shall have occasion to discuss the question more fully in a subsequent chapter.[2] I only draw attention to it here to point out that of the three women named by S. Luke, S. Matthew mentions two, who continued watching the sepulchre after the preparations for burial had been concluded, and Joseph had "rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb, and departed. And Mary Magdalene was there, and the other Mary, sitting

[1] *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 53.
[2] Ch. ix, *Other Women at the Tomb.*

over against the sepulchre." [1] And of these same women S. Mark writes, they " beheld where he was laid." [2]

Thus these two women became the last witnesses among His disciples of the entombment of the Lord. They were the last to behold the Lord's body laid within the tomb and the stone rolled before the door. They were the first to see that stone rolled away and the tomb bereft of the body which they had last seen within it. While the other women, their companions, had departed, as S. Luke tells us, to purchase spices and to rest on the Sabbath, which was so rapidly approaching, the two Maries still lingered contemplating a spot now become sacred to them, they were " sitting over against the sepulchre "(Matthew), and they " beheld where he was laid " (Mark).

A notice by S. Mark (xvi. 1, R.V.), further compels the belief that what the rest of the women did before sundown on Friday, that is, before the Jewish

[1] Matt. xxvii. 60, 61, R.V. It may be well to gather up here what the Gospels tell us of this " other Mary." She was the wife of Clopas (John xix. 25, R.V.), who is generally supposed to be the same as Alphæus, the father of James, mentioned in the four lists of the Apostles (Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, Luke vi. 15, Acts i. 13). In Mark xv. 40, she is styled : " Mary the mother of James the less [Gr., little] and of Joses." As Matthew or Levi is called " the son of Alphæus " (Mark ii. 14), this Apostle may possibly be brother of James and Joses. So the Rev. B. Reynolds (Murray's *Bible Dict.*, art. *James*), who adds : " probably, however, a different person." Yet some may consider it just as probable that the two are the same. Dr. Swete (*The Gospel acc. to S. Mark*, ii. 14) quotes from Photius :—" Two out of the twelve were publicans, Matthew and James." If we accept the probability, Mary and these two Apostles, her sons, were witnesses of the crucifixion and death of the Lord.

[2] Mark xv. 47.

Sabbath began, these two Maries postponed till after sundown on Saturday, that is, as soon as the Jewish Sabbath was ended :—" And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him." It is important to observe the change from the pluperfect to the preterite made by the New Testament Revisers. The reason may best be stated in the words of Canon Cook :—" Our translators [i.e., A.V.] evidently identified these three holy women with the others ' who came with Him from Galilee,' and prepared ' spices and ointments ' on Friday evening, in the short interval between the entombment and sunset : cf. Luke xxiii. 55, 56. St. Mark's account is precise. Mary Magdalene, the other Mary, and Salome did not purchase the spices, which they brought with them, before the evening of Saturday. Our Evangelist does not mention by name Joanna (see Luke xxiv. 10), nor Susanna, nor the other women who came with them from Galilee. We have, therefore, clear indications of two separate groups." [1]

We shall return to these women in the next chapter ; but before doing so there is yet another incident, recorded only by S. Matthew, which ought not to be omitted. This Evangelist relates that on the next day, that is, the Sabbath, the chief priests and the Pharisees waited upon Pilate to demand of him a guard for the tomb, " lest haply his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead." Pilate bid them : " Take a guard " (Matt. xxvii. 65, R.V.

[1] *Speaker's Comm., in loc.*

marg.). This they did forthwith :—"And made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them."

The critics, of course, pronounce this to be a legend. Naturally ; for it contributes in no slight degree to augment the evidence for the Resurrection miracle. It is important, therefore, to satisfy our own minds as to the reasonableness and probability of the incident being indeed a historic fact. This is denied by the critics on the ground that it is wanting in the three other Gospels ; and that it is a tradition independent of the account given by S. Mark, and subsequently embodied by the redactor or editor of S. Matthew. For answer to this it will be sufficient to bear in mind a few facts concerning the author of the first Gospel.

And first, That S. Matthew was the actual author of this Gospel is not indeed stated by himself, nor to be proved on the evidence of any contemporary witness. On the other hand, however, it is an undoubted fact that the universal belief of the early Church was that he was the author ;[1] and further, that there is no existing record of any dissentient from this universal opinion. It is, therefore, too late in the day to attempt, in the twentieth century, the overthrow of this opinion, and that, without solid ground for doubting its truth.

Add to this, That S. Matthew was one of the Twelve, called to be an Apostle by the Lord Himself,

[1] "To him (Matthew), quite an obscure apostle, tradition uniformly and in all circles assigns our first Gospel."—J. V. Bartlet, in Hastings's *Dict. of Bible*, art. *Gospel of Matthew* vol. iii, p. 297*a*.

and as such, present with Christ during the whole of His ministry until the day when He was taken up from His disciples into Heaven.

Now the inference from these two facts is, I think, plain, and one that ought to commend itself to common sense. If S. Matthew be accepted as the author of the Gospel that bears his name, and if he was the constant companion of the Lord, whose words and works he relates, what need had he to go about gathering up from this one and that incidents and information for the writing of his book? What more natural, what more probable, than that such a man should rely upon his own experience and memory for all that he chose to enter upon his pages?[1] All this will apply to his Gospel in general; but we are here concerned especially with the incident of the guard granted by Pilate. Why should we expect that the account of this should come to us from the pen of Matthew and not from any of the three other Evangelists?

First, I answer, Because S. Matthew, writing for Jews of Palestine principally, would be concerned with the story (that the disciples had stolen the Lord's body) in circulation in Palestine, the fraudulence of which, being quickly discovered, utterly discredited it, probably before the other Gospels appeared. S. Matthew alone had occasion to relate the incident; the other Evangelists,

[1] The obvious exceptions to this are, of course, the narratives of those scenes and discourses which the Evangelist himself could not have seen nor heard, such as The Transfiguration and the discourse on Olivet, at which S. Matthew was not present. But these, like the story of the guard, it is safe to believe are faithful reports of what he had received from actual witnesses.

writing for readers distant in time and place, would naturally pass over in silence the fraudulent story of the Pharisees, to which all credence had ceased to be given.

There is, too, further reason, in his office and position, why S. Matthew rather than any of the other Evangelists should be able to furnish this account. Sir William Ramsay has shown[1] that Julius Cæsar, in B.C. 47-44, and after him, that the Emperor Augustus, A.D. 6, made a change in the law regulating the customs in Palestine, abrogating the *publicani* and bringing the revenues under direct imperial control. Thus, S. Matthew, instead of being responsible to that powerful and tyrannical body known as the *publicani*, as he would have been had he lived prior to A.D. 6, collected the revenues for, and made his return directly to, the imperial government in Judæa. This would bring him more or less into contact with both the civil and military services of the province, and we can easily understand, therefore, why his Gospel rather than the others contains the record of the guard at the tomb. He would probably have made acquaintance in the course of his official duties with the officers and soldiery then stationed at Jerusalem; as he also through this knowledge probably obtained closer access to the Lord's Person on Calvary, similar to that which S. John's intimacy gave him in the house of the High Priest. This, I think, most naturally and most reasonably accounts for the fuller and more minute details in connexion

[1] Hastings's *Dict. of Bible*, art. *Roads and Travel in N.T.*, vol. v, p. 395.

with the last cry from the cross given by S. Matthew, whom I take to be an eyewitness of all that he related. And, in the same way, I conclude that the various details touching the granting of the guard by Pilate, its posting at the sepulchre, the sealing of the stone, the earthquake, the descent of the angel, the swoon of the soldiers, their appearance before the Sanhedrin, all became known to S. Matthew through this intimacy with the imperial officials, an intimacy not enjoyed, so far as we know, by any other of the Evangelists.

CHAPTER VI.

THE STONE ROLLED AWAY.

'He is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him!"—Mark xvi. 6, R.V.

WE now enter upon the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection, and it may make the study of this more easy for the student if, at the outset, I state briefly the plan on which I propose to deal with it. Generally speaking, expositors regard the narrative of the Resurrection morning as an account of two visits made to the sepulchre: one, by women, the other, by the Apostles Peter and John; and they endeavour, under these two heads, to bring into harmony the several histories of the four Evangelists.

It may, therefore, be well for me to state plainly here that I recognize the Evangelistic record as presenting us with an account of five distinct visits; differing in time, differing in persons, and differing in circumstances; made successively on that morning to the sepulchre where the body of the Lord Jesus had been laid. They are the visits of:—

I. Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and (possibly) Joanna.

II. S. Peter and S. John.

III. Mary Magdalene.

IV. The "other women", unnamed, related by S. Luke only, but their subsequent meeting with the Lord related by S. Matthew only.

V. S. Peter.

These, then, will form the subjects for our consideration in this and succeeding chapters.

All the four Evangelists agree in mentioning Mary Magdalene as the first, or among the first, to visit the sepulchre. S. Matthew joins her name with that of "the other Mary" [1] and to these two S. Mark adds that of Salome.[2] S. Luke adds yet another name, Joanna, omitting, however, that of Salome:—"They were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James." [3] S. John records the name of Mary Magdalene only, giving us the further information:—"She runneth therefore, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him." [4] From the words "WE know not" Mary indicated to the two Apostles that she was associated with others in her visit to the sepulchre; but whether this "we" points to the women who accompanied her thither or signifies that these, or some of them, returned with her is quite immaterial.

The time when these women visited the sepulchre must first engage our attention. The Evangelists who record this visit agree in stating that it was at early dawn on the first day of the week—that is,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 1.
[2] Mark xvi. 1.
[3] Luke xxiv. 10, R.V.
[4] John xx. 2, R.V.

on our Sunday. And the fact that they (Matthew, Mark, and John), while agreeing in this statement, each use different terms to express it, indicates the truth and independence of their testimony. But because S. Matthew writes that "Late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre", critics think that the Evangelist, wittingly or unwittingly, altered the narrative of S. Mark, which they suppose he copied. That there can be any contradiction of himself by S. Matthew when he writes that the event he is describing happened "late on the Sabbath day" and at the same time "as it began to dawn" is simply impossible. And yet expositors all confess to some difficulty as to the meaning of his words. "It is impossible" says the Rev. C. H. Robinson[1] "to suppose that the writer of the first Gospel, who was writing for Jewish readers, could have intended to convey the impression that the Sabbath extended beyond 6 P.M. on Saturday." But, if so, how can the women be described as coming as it began to dawn? There must be a considerable interval between sunset and sunrise.

Is it not possible to solve the difficulty by accepting Archdeacon Townson's suggestion, referred to in the *Speaker's Commentary*, that the word "came" should be rather translated as "went"—a not infrequent rendering, as the Archdeacon shows,[2] of the word in the New Testament? Thus

[1] *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, p. 66.
[2] *Six Discourses on the Four Gospels*, p. 352 and note.

the course of these women as it passed through the Evangelist's mind would be described from beginning to end; they went late on the Sabbath, that is, to purchase the spices; they went as it began to dawn, that is, to bring these spices to the tomb. One easily perceives how natural is this elliptical form of statement to a writer whose mind is crowded with details but who is unpractised in the expression of his thoughts; he is apt to let slip much of what is present to his own mind but which, unexpressed, obviously leaves his readers in some doubt. That such a combination as I suppose, is here intended by S. Matthew, is also the opinion of Archdeacon Allen:—"He [Matthew] seems to have wished to omit the 'purchase,' but not to have cared to pass over the note of time attached to it." [1]

But, whatever interpretation we may be disposed to give to the words, of one thing we may be certain, that they afford no evidence that S. Matthew was copying S. Mark. Why should he? Why must we assume that he knew less of these tremendous events than S. Mark? An Apostle, an intimate friend of the holy women who experienced these wonders, one of the company to whom these women had narrated their experiences, what need had S. Matthew of any assistance from any one, man or woman, for setting down in writing his own recollections of that eventful and never-to-be-forgotten morning?

We may now take up the prefatory statement with which S. Matthew introduces the visit of the

[1] *Internat. Crit. Comm.*, Matt. xxviii. 1.

women. From what I have shown at the close of the last chapter regarding his official position, we will not be surprised to find this Evangelist still making use of such information as it might enable him to obtain, information not so easily accessible, possibly even unknown, to the other Evangelists. Parenthetically,[1] as it appears to me, S. Matthew introduces his account of the visit of the two Maries by a description, apparently furnished to him by an eyewitness, of the occurrences that accompanied the Lord's Resurrection:—"And behold, there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the watchers did quake, and became as dead men."[2]

Now, to the sceptic and to the believer these words have a very different import according to that which each sees, or does not see, in the description. The sceptic views it as a myth, a traditionary figment, simply on account of the supernatural wonder it relates. The believer, on the other hand, gladly accepts it as historic truth on account of the supernatural wonder it does *not* relate; for it makes no mention whatever of that which we would naturally expect, the Resurrection itself. The earth-

[1] That the stone had been rolled away before the arrival of the women, appears from S. Mark's account, which declares that the women approaching the sepulchre "were saying among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb? and looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back."—Mark xvi. 3, 4, R.V.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 2, 3, 4, R.V.

quake, the angel, the rolling away of the mighty stone, are here no preparations for that mighty Act, no removal of obstacles to the exodus of the glorious Dead.[1] On the contrary, they are the loud challenge to the watchers before the grave: Come see where the Lord lay, He is not here, He is risen! In silent, secret majesty the Resurrection had become an accomplished fact, a royal progress of which no mortal might be spectator. But this is by no means the way in which the human imagination delivers its fancies. When given the rein, the supernatural is distorted into the monstrous. For this, undoubtedly, we may appeal to facts. In 1892 a fragment of an early Christian document known as the *Gospel of St. Peter* was discovered in Upper Egypt. Dr. Swete fixes its date as not earlier than A.D. 150. From his translation I give the following extract relating to the Resurrection: "Now on the night when the Lord's Day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept guard by two and two in a watch, there was a great voice in heaven, and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descend from thence with much light and draw

[1] What ground has Mr. Thompson for his assertion (*Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 182):—"But in Mt. the stone is removed by the angel; and why? Not that the angel may go in, *but that Jesus may come out*"? Or again (p. 205):—"S. Matthew thinks that the rolling away of the stone is necessary for the Resurrection"? Quite opposite the judgement of the learned Bishop Horsley, the father of English exegetical criticism; That the stone was rolled away "not to let the Lord out, but to let the women in."—*Sermons on the Resurrection*, Sermon iv, p. 202.

So too Bishop Gore:—"He rose from the dead (as is apparently implied in the narrative of S. Matthew), leaving the gravestone undisturbed. The angel rolled it away to show that He was risen."—*The Body of Christ*, p. 127.

nigh unto the tomb. And the stone which had been cast at the door rolled away of itself and made way in part, and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered in. The soldiers, therefore, when they saw it, awakened the centurion and the elders (for they were also there keeping watch); and as they told the things that they had seen, again they see three men coming forth from the tomb, two of them supporting the other, and a cross following them; and the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of Him who was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Thou didst preach to them that sleep; and a response was heard from the cross, Yea." [1]

Here, then, we have the results to which it is possible for tradition to attain. The imagination of a panic-stricken soldier runs riot, and out of some over-hanging rock or outstretched bough, he conjures up a human form reaching to the heavens, supported on either side by forms, whether angelic or human he cannot say, with a luminous cross following in the wake of the procession. On some such substratum each succeeding story-teller builds his own addition, till every vestige of historical fact is lost in the fanciful and unreal.

Now the real marvel is that all trace of these crude imaginings is wanting in the narrative of S. Matthew. We look in vain for any approach to it. In his account we have nothing more than what the severest investigator, himself moving among

[1] H. B. Swete, *The Apocryphal Gospel of S. Peter*, tr., § ix, p. 26 f.

the events he describes, might be expected to deliver as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He tells us only that which must have been apparent to, and attested by, the whole band of soldiers who were spectators of the scene. They felt the trembling earth, they beheld the Shining One descend from above, they saw the stone rolled from its place before the door, and that is all. Yet no, there is one other fact told, not as by one anxious to embellish his story, but incidentally, a little later on, when some of the guard went into the city to report to the chief priests the occurrences of the morning. And here we get undeniable, because absolutely undesigned, testimony to the empty tomb. Along with the "large money" given to the soldiers, we have the words spoken by the elders and chief priests:—"Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept."[1] Therefore, the soldiers must have told of a search which failed to discover the body, of a sealed tomb opened, and found empty.

"But" we are told "none of this is to be found in S. Mark, the earliest and most reliable of our Gospel histories." But why should S. Mark relate it? Even suppose him to be the earliest and most reliable of the four Evangelists—which is by no means the unanimous verdict of critics—what right have we to expect to find the story of the guard related in his Gospel? Is there anything known of S. Mark's life, or occupation, or surroundings, such as is told us of S. Matthew, to lead us to the conclusion that he had any such oppor-

[1] Matt. xxviii. 13.

tunities of conversing with the Roman soldiers as we have seen may naturally have been given to S. Matthew ? [1] If S. Matthew relates what he had ample opportunity to examine and attest, S. Mark omits all this for the simple reason that the same opportunity had not been given to him.[2] He, like the first Evangelist, was, though not an Apostle, a disciple of the Lord ; like him too, intimately acquainted with the Maries and other women who had followed Jesus from Galilee to the cross ; and, therefore, he and S. Matthew are found in close agreement when relating what each most probably gathered from the same source—the women who had followed Christ and were present at the tomb. This plain and common-sense view completely disposes of Mr. Thompson's unsupported opinion that " The incident of the guard, and the earthquake and descent of an angel bring confusion into the narrative, and offer no recommendation as against the earlier evidence of Mk."[3]

We now return to the women at the sepulchre. They are three, possibly four, in number. And the

[1] See above, p. 96 f. Certainly we have more ground for supposing S. Mark's account of the Crucifixion and his record of the Centurion's words upon the death of Christ to be his own (Mark's) description as that of an eyewitness, than for the belief that it was derived, as Mr. Thompson supposes (see *Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 173) from the Centurion.

[2] This sufficiently answers Mr. Thompson's extraordinary assertion, that " It [the story of the guard] supposes a state of things which, according to St. Mark, did not exist." (*Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 181). What an utter perversion of Scripture, to declare that an inspired Writer denies a fact only because he is silent about it !

[3] J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 184.

account of their visit, let it be carefully noted, is preserved for us only by S. Matthew and S. Mark. S. John's account, indeed, recognizes the visit (xx. 1, 2), but gives us no details. In a future chapter,[1] I hope to be able to prove that S. Luke's account (xxiv. 1-9) of a visit by women to the sepulchre is a totally different incident from that in the narrative common to S. Matthew and S. Mark. I only notice this here as no inconsiderable portion of the so-called confusion or errors of the Scripture narratives arises from the confusion by interpreters of incidents which Scripture most carefully distinguishes.

Turning now to the account common to Matthew and to Mark we notice one or two points which give the critics much concern.

(1) As to the women visiting the sepulchre who are named by each Evangelist, surely the omission or insertion of one or more names by any Evangelist does not necessarily imply that he contradicts the rest. If S. Mark joins Salome to the two Maries, we may not therefore conclude that S. Matthew naming only "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary"[2], either denies or is ignorant of the presence of Salome also. His mention of the two Maries only is sufficiently explained by the fact that he had only just recorded their presence at the tomb on Friday evening "sitting over against the sepulchre"[3], after Joseph had laid the body of the Lord within the tomb and rolled the stone against the door. Whether by design or not, it certainly is the

[1] Ch. ix, *Other Women at the Tomb.*
[2] Matt. xxviii. 1. [3] Matt. xxvii. 61.

most natural thing in the world that he should name those as first at the sepulchre on the Sunday morning whom he had just represented as last at the tomb on the Friday evening before.

(2) And this also may serve to explain another supposed discrepancy which the critics are not slow to imagine. They think it a serious contradiction that S. Matthew speaks of the two women as coming "to see the sepulchre", while S. Mark says of the three whom he mentions that they came to "anoint him." Would any reasonable man suppose that because S. Matthew wrote, the women came to see the sepulchre, he meant to assert that they did not come to anoint the body of Christ, unless he had so expressly stated it? Do not his previous words, telling us that these women were sitting over against the sepulchre on the evening of Friday, explain his mention of their desire on Sunday morning "to see the sepulchre"?

(3) A third point which offends the critics is that they suppose that S. Matthew imagines the Resurrection and the rolling away of the stone to have taken place "in the sight of the women."[1] Thus Professor K. Lake writes:—"If one take the Johannine account, there is no room for the guard at the tomb in the various events recorded as taking place on the morning of the third day; but still more difficult is it if one take the Marcan narrative. In the first place, the mission of the women shows that the only difficulty which they anticipated in entering the tomb to anoint the body was the stone at the entrance. How can this be explained if

[1] J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the N. T.*, p. 182.

there was a guard at the tomb ? " [1] Is this a right understanding of S. Matthew's words ? It is quite true that the Evangelist describes the earthquake, the angel, the rolling away of the stone, in conjunction with his mention of the women's visit to the tomb. But do his words imply necessarily that these occurrences took place after the arrival of the women ? I have already hinted that the words are to be taken parenthetically ; and their introduction by the formula, " And behold " (*καὶ ἰδού, kai idou*), lends itself, I think, to this interpretation. This formula is of frequent use by S. Matthew[2] as a sort of introduction to a new section or subject added to what was already written, without, however, implying that what it introduces is simultaneous with what precedes.

But supposing for the moment that the first view of S. Matthew's words does imply that the women whom he names were present at the rolling away of the stone and witnessed the descent of the angels and the swoon of the soldiers,[3] we are still left with the difficulty that the accounts of S. John and S. Mark do not afford any indication that these women had witnessed any of the incidents recorded by S. Matthew. Unless, therefore, S. Matthew expressly declares that these events occurred in the presence of the women, it is only reasonable to assume the probability that S. Matthew only inserted them parenthetically, as information derived from the guard and not from the women,

[1] *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 179.

[2] See p. 163 f. and notes.

[3] So, Alford, *Comm., in loc.* :—" The women were *witnesses of the earthquake*, and *that which happened.*" And Meyer, to the same effect. *Comm., in loc.*

and that all were over and the soldiers gone from the scene before the arrival of the women. And this becomes more reasonable if we accept the opinion of Gilbert West,[1] that these supernatural manifestations were designed by God as absolutely necessary to drive away the soldiers and open the way into the sepulchre, thus affording an access to it for the women, which would otherwise have been impossible. And if I am right in assuming the possibility of S. Matthew's acquaintance with the centurion and soldiers, or some of them, then this amply accounts for his Gospel containing the story which is not found in those of S. John and S. Mark.

(4) The last point I dwell upon is the indifference displayed by S. Matthew as regards these women who visited the sepulchre compared with the importance which he attaches to what they saw, and heard, and felt, and did. He takes no notice, as we have seen, of the departure of Mary Magdalene on the one hand, nor of the arrival of Salome on the other. And yet, though, of the two women mentioned by him, one only was present throughout, nevertheless he writes as if these two women were they who actually saw and heard the angel, received his message, and departed quickly on their errand. This, however, by no means necessitates the conclusion that he was ignorant of the changes in the group; but rather, that he dwelt only upon that which seemed to him most important for his purpose, the witness borne by

[1] *Observations on the Resurrection*, § xii, p. 69.

women—whoever they might be—to the emptiness of the tomb.

I ask particular attention here to this fact, because it indicates why S. Matthew's account of the first visit to the sepulchre must be held to terminate with the words, they "ran to bring his disciples word" (xxviii. 8, R.V.), the succeeding verse being a description of an appearance of Jesus to other women, at a later period in the morning. The fuller consideration of this will be taken up in a subsequent chapter.[1]

When the two, possibly three, women were approaching the sepulchre, they began to question one another "Who shall roll us away the stone?" upon which, looking up, they saw that it had been rolled away.

This word, "rolled away", is common to the three synoptic Gospels. But because S. John uses another word, "taken away", a word in its first meaning signifying "raised" or "lifted", the new critics imagine that they have here a contradiction between the fourth and the three other Gospels. Professor K. Lake argues from it that S. John's tomb was of a different character from that of the other Evangelists. "It was a mausoleum," he writes "with the actual grave in the middle of the floor; it was closed by a stone which had to be 'lifted.'" And, lower down, he continues: "ἠρμένον [*ērmenon*, taken away, lifted] surely implies a stone lifted away from the tomb—not rolled away from its entrance."[2] I cannot accept the Professor's "surely" here. Because the Greek

[1] Ch. ix., *Other Women at the Tomb.*

[2] *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 134.

αἴρω (*airō*) originally means, *to raise*, or *lift*, it does not follow that the word never signifies *to take away*, or *remove*. As a matter of fact, one sense is as common as the other. Like the word *tollere* in Latin, and our own word *lift*, in the phrase "cattle-lifting", the derivative sense, of *taking away*, or *removal*, is of the commonest occurrence, without any reference to its original sense of *lifting* or *raising*, as of a weight. And when Professor Lake argues that the word must here mean *lifting* or *raising up*, he might just as well assert that the cattle-lifter who is stealing his neighbour's ox is carrying it under his arm, because the word *lift* is used of raising a weight of some kind or other.

But it is a needless waste of time to attempt replying to absurd objections raised by negative criticism to prove discrepancies between the four Evangelists because S. Matthew declares an angel "*rolled* away the stone"[1]; S. Mark, that the women saw that it was "*rolled* back"[2]; S. Luke, that "they found the stone *rolled* away from the tomb"[3]; but S. John, that Mary Magdalene saw the stone was "*taken away* from the tomb."[4] Surely, no fair-minded, honest reader can suppose for one moment that because one writer says that a woman saw the stone was removed he therefore contradicted another who writes that the same stone had been rolled away. The idea is simply ridiculous.

And quite as ridiculous is the conclusion that S. Matthew's "angel" grew out of S. Mark's "young man" (νεανίσκος, *neaniskos*), in order to

[1] Matt. xxviii. 2, R.V. [2] Mark xvi. 4, R.V.
[3] Luke xxiv. 2, R.V. [4] John xx. 1, R.V.

explain the introduction of the supernatural. Surely the Scriptures furnish ample evidence that man and angel are used interchangeably whenever it is intended to describe a vision of angels in the form in which they appeared to the beholder. Thus the two angels, as they are called (Gen. xix. 1), who visited Lot in Sodom are styled men in the very same chapter, verse 10. So, the undoubtedly supernatural Being who appeared to Joshua at the opening of his campaign in Canaan :—"There stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand."[1] And again, when Daniel describes the angel who appeared to him on the banks of the Hiddekel, he writes of him, that he saw "a certain man clothed in linen."[2] In spite of this common use of Scripture, which sufficiently warrants the identification of S. Mark's "young man" with the "angel" of S. Matthew, Mr. Thompson expends considerable pains and some ingenuity in endeavouring to prove to us that this young man may be no other than S. Mark himself.[3] And even so careful and Scriptural an expositor as Mr. Latham, would have us believe that the two men of whom

[1] Joshua v. 13. [2] Dan. x. 5.

[3] J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the N.T.*, p. 176. Mr. Thompson assumes that the "young man" who may be Mark was the same who followed Jesus in the garden where he was seized by the guards who were sent to take Jesus, and from whom he escaped by leaving in their hands the linen cloth which was cast round his body. Thus he would account for the knowledge of the prediction spoken by the Lord before His agony in the garden. But is it not against the whole tenor of the Gospel history to suppose that our Lord, from the sitting down to the Last Supper to the betrayal in the garden, was accompanied by any but the Twelve? The three Synoptists specially mention that He sat down with the Apostles; S.

S. Luke writes and whose appearance he, like so many others, identifies with the appearance described in Matthew and Mark, were two Essenes or priests clothed in the white robes of their order, who, as secret believers in the Lord, had come to the sepulchre, and informed the women of His Resurrection.[1] Why make so absurd a perversion of the Sacred Scriptures? How could the white robes of a priest account for the amazement with which these women "went out, and fled from the tomb"[2]?

But there is, I think, one remarkable fact connected with this appearance of the angel, which, so far as I know, has been entirely overlooked by commentators, and which, if I am correct, makes this interpretation absolutely impossible.

Both S. Matthew and S. Mark agree in putting into the angel's mouth, as a message to be carried by the women to the disciples of Christ, the words spoken by the Lord in the garden of Gethsemane on the night before His Crucifixion. That this is so is admitted by all commentators, and is established by the use of the remarkable word uttered by the Lord on that solemn occasion: "I will go before [*προάξω, proaxō*] you"—Matt. xxvi. 32. It was on this occasion also that S. Peter gave utter-

John (xviii. 1) declares that Jesus, on the conclusion of His great prayer of intercession, "went forth with his disciples", *disciples* being this Evangelist's usual designation for Apostles. Is it likely that in this upper room, and among these Apostles, was also sitting a young man with "a linen cloth cast about his naked body"? It is most improbable, and unsupported by any evidence, so far as I know, that others besides the Eleven heard the words spoken by our Lord at this time and place.

[1] H. K. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 317. [2] Mark xvi. 8

ance to his emphatic protest: "If all shall be offended in thee, I will never be offended." [1]

Now then, I ask, How came S. Mark, or any human being whatever outside the Eleven, to know these words of our Lord spoken in Gethsemane, in the silence of the night, when none but the Eleven stood around Him? [2] But if it be the fact that the Eleven alone heard this prediction as it fell from the lips of the Lord, the message supernaturally conveyed by the angel to the women must be taken as a sort of private password, a secret cipher known only to the Lord Himself and to the Eleven to whom He gave it, which He now uses to quicken their faith and prepare them for His own appearance, which He was so soon to manifest to them, on that selfsame day. The fact also gives force and meaning to the significant addition found in S. Mark and, though unmentioned, uncontradicted by S. Matthew: "Tell His disciples, AND PETER"—the man who had so loudly vaunted his own superior courage and constancy, and yet who had so lamentably failed when the hour of trial overtook him. How tender, how loving the assurance in the two words AND PETER.

Again, if the fact be admitted, this message committed to the women is but the token, the secret cipher, as I have called it, understood between the Master and the disciples; but in no sense to be here taken, as it is so often, for a command [3] for the disciples' immediate departure into Galilee; rather is it the indication that such instructions were shortly to be received from the lips of the Lord

[1] Matt. xxvi. 33, R.V. [2] See note at end of chapter.
[3] See K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 70.

Himself. To the women who received it, it may have been, in great measure it must have been, unintelligible. They were but the Lord's messengers. They could witness to the empty tomb, to the vision and voice of the angel; but the secret prediction of the Master, spoken in no ear but theirs, was the sure token to the Apostles that He who spoke it, who was dead, was now alive for evermore.[1]

With this message, then, the three women went quickly out of the sepulchre "with fear and great joy, and ran to bring his disciples word"—so, S. Matthew. S. Mark:—"They went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid."

This supplemental word of S. Mark, "They said nothing to any one" (not "any man", as A.V.), is, I cannot help thinking, a very strong confirmation of what I have stated above, the distinction which must be made between those women who received the message from the angel and these others who, as S. Matthew proceeds to relate, were met by the Lord on their way from the sepulchre; for, if they were the same women, how could it be declared of them that "they said nothing to any one"? The former, having received the message, were directed to "Go quickly, and tell his disciples", which command they implicitly obeyed, as, according to S. Mark, "They went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to any one; for they

[1] See below, ch. ix, p. 144 f.

were afraid." Thus, by observing the distinction between the two groups of women in S. Matthew, what is thought to be a contradiction is removed when we perceive that S. Matthew records only the angelic command, "Go quickly", without notice of its fulfilment; S. Mark, on the other hand, reports the fulfilment, "They said nothing to any one", omitting the instruction as given by S. Matthew, "Go quickly" (ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι, *tachu poreutheisai*). S. Mark by his words by no means implies an absolute silence throughout the day on the part of the women, but merely that they neither delayed nor were interrupted in their journey to deliver their message to the Apostles.

Let me now sum up the experience of these women: Mary the mother of James, and Salome, and, possibly, Joanna, on this morning of the Resurrection. As they approached the tomb, they saw that the stone had been rolled away and, looking through the entrance, they beheld an angel, in appearance as a man, who told them that the Lord was not there, He was risen, and bid them come and see for themselves the place where the Lord lay. The angel then giving them, as a sort of cryptogram, words spoken by the Lord only three nights before, and only to the Eleven, bid them depart quickly and carry the message to the Apostles; whereupon they departed out of the sepulchre, trembling and astonished, and ran to bring His disciples word. There is nothing in all that the two Evangelists have said to make us conclude that either the haste or astonishment or awe of the women rendered them incapable,

first, of observing, and afterwards, relating, all that they saw and heard.

All this was related by them forthwith to the Apostles, but whether to these singly, or in groups, or to all gathered into one company, we are not told and have no means of judging. S. Matthew and S. Peter, however, being Apostles, heard their tale; and S. Mark, if tradition report him truly, being a resident in or near Jerusalem, a disciple of the Lord, and intimate also with all His disciples, must have learned their story from the lips of the women themselves.[1] Thus we obtain two separate and, as I hold, independent narratives of the same event, presenting many differences, but not a single discrepancy throughout. To say, as modern criticism does, that S. Matthew wrote with the Gospel of S. Mark before him, is, and can be, nothing more than a conjecture, a conjecture, moreover, fraught with every kind of danger to the historicity of both narratives. With all due respect, therefore, for the ability and the ingenuity displayed by the critics in working out their theory, I see nothing either in their methods or their results to move me from

[1] What I have written above as to S. Mark's account being a record of what he himself may have heard from the women who related it, and at the time of their relating, is not meant to conflict in any way with the general opinion prevalent from the earliest days of the Church's history, that S. Mark wrote under the direction of the Apostle Peter. It is only in the history of the Passion and Resurrection that the possibility of S. Mark's presence throughout among the followers of Jesus, combined with the many autoptic touches in his narrative, makes me here regard S. Mark in the light of an eyewitness.

See also *The One Volume Bible Comm.* (*S. Mark, Introd.*), p. 722:—"It would appear that St. Mark, though not technically a 'hearer' of Jesus, was at least a witness of some of the events of Holy Week."

the older and, as I believe, sounder criticism that sees in these two Evangelists faithful historians of what they heard with their own ears from the women who repeated the facts.

NOTE ON THE REVISERS' TRANSLATION OF MARK XIV. 51: "FOLLOWED WITH HIM."—*Page* 115.

It has been supposed by some (e.g., by Dr. Swete) that the young man who, with a linen cloth cast about his naked body (Mark xiv. 51), followed Jesus, may have been with Jesus and the Apostles when these words were spoken. This opinion is based upon the reading of the Greek text adopted, and apparently rightly, by the Revisers. The Authorized Version reads: "A young man 'followed him'"—ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ (*ēkolouthei autō*). Instead of this the Revisers read συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ (*sunēkolouthei autō*), which they wrongly translate "followed with him." I say *wrongly* because, whichever reading be adopted, the object of the verb is the same: the young man followed *him*. But in the compound verb the sense conveyed is, The young man followed him with—that is, along with—some other person or persons; certainly not "Followed with him", which would necessarily imply that both the young man and Jesus were following some one else. But this is plainly not what is intended by the Greek expression; for, had it been so, we should have had a separate preposition inserted before the pronoun *him*. This may easily be seen by comparing Mark v. 37, the only other passage in this Gospel in which the compound word συνακολουθεῖν (*sunakolouthein*), *to follow with*, occurs. There we are told that Jesus "suffered no man to follow with him [μετ' αὐτοῦ, *met autou*], save Peter", etc.; and we see the necessity for inserting the preposition μετά (*meta*), *with*, before *him*, since, not only Peter, and James, and John, but Jesus Himself together with them, followed Jaïrus, as we are expressly told by S. Matthew (ix. 19):—"And Jesus arose, and followed him, and so did his disciples."

All, therefore, that can be gathered from this amended text is that the young man was one of the many who, out of curiosity, hate, or anxiety, would have been found in the crowd round Judas as he followed after Jesus to take Him.

Precisely in the same way must we correct the Revisers' mistranslation of Luke xxiii. 49, the only other place where this compound verb συνακολουθεῖν (*sunakolouthein*) occurs. The women there spoken of followed Christ in a company: He was the One being followed—not part of a company which was following Himself!

CHAPTER VII.

THE EMPTY TOMB.

"... the linen cloths lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up in a place by itself."—John. xx. 6, 7, R.V.

WE now proceed to consider the next visit to the tomb. The history of this is given to us by S. John alone of the four Evangelists. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" being one of the two who made this visit to the sepulchre, gives to his account a special authority. His name entirely removes the account from the traditional and establishes it absolutely as a first-hand authority.

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, Mary Magdalene left the city with her companions, bringing the spices bought after sunset on the preceding evening, wherewith to anoint the Lord's body. All together approached the sepulchre, questioning one another as they went, "Who shall roll us away the stone ...?" till, looking up, they saw that it had been already rolled away.[1] Upon this, it would appear that, without waiting for further examination, Mary separated herself from her companions and ran back forthwith to bring word to "Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved", "They have taken away the

[1] Mark xvi. 3, 4.

Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him." [1]

Starting from their house, the two Apostles ran together to the tomb, the younger outstripping Peter. Arrived at the tomb, John waited for his companion, contenting himself with the sight of the linen cloths, which he beheld whilst stooping at the door. Peter, however, coming after, went at once into the tomb to inspect and ascertain its condition for himself:—"He beholdeth the linen cloths lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up[2] in a place by itself." John then enters, "and he saw, and believed." Upon which, we are told, "the disciples went away again unto their own home."

It seems reasonable to assume that, during the interval between Mary's departure from her companions and the arrival of Peter and John at the sepulchre, these women had entered the tomb and beheld the angel and, having received his message for the disciples, had immediately departed from the place. Of course, it is quite possible that they might have met Peter and John on the way to the tomb; but on this the Scripture is silent. They might even have been still in the tomb when the Apostles arrived; but the narrative does not suggest even a hint of their presence. The close scrutiny

[1] John xx. 1, 2, R.V.

[2] "The primary notion of the verb ἐντυλίσσω [*entulissō*]," says Mr. Latham "was to 'wind about.'" "We might say that the cloth was lying on the slab 'wound round.'" See the very full discussion of the word in the Rev. H. Latham's *Risen Master*, ch. ii, note B, p. 89.

of S. Peter, so far as S. John tells us, discovers no trace of either angel or woman. That the two men were alone is a natural inference from the narrative.

The publication of *The Risen Master* by the Rev. Henry Latham, M.A., has given a fresh interest and peculiar importance to the evidence for the Resurrection afforded by this visit to the sepulchre. In this volume the author points out that the close scrutiny of the disposition of the grave-clothes made by the two Apostles resulted in convincing the disciple whom Jesus loved that the Lord was truly and supernaturally raised from the dead. Mr. Latham's treatment of the subject is so important that I cannot forbear a short résumé of it here.

What first presented itself to the eyes of S. John as he looked through the open door was a ledge of rock slightly raised above the general floor of the tomb, and at one end of this ledge another narrow ledge crosswise, pillow-like, of perhaps two inches high. Upon the lower and larger slab he beheld the linen cloths that had wrapped the body of the Lord "lying". This word, *lying*, from its position in the sentence has a peculiar emphasis, implying, not that the cloths lay scattered about as they would have fallen had the body been carried off in haste, but that they lay stretched out flat. This is what struck the eye of the beloved Apostle, and arrested his steps as he looked within the door. In the words of Mr. Latham :—" There must have been something in the disposition of the cloths which struck him as different from what he would have expected, and this is what he means to express by

introducing the word 'lying,' and laying the emphasis upon it." [1]

As they lay they at once suggested to the Apostle that the Lord "withdrew from His grave-clothes without disturbing their arrangement; on His retiring from them, the linen cloths fell flat on the rock, because their support was withdrawn, and because they were borne down by the hundred pounds' weight of aloes and myrrh." [2] Stopped by this spectacle, rather than from any thought of courtesy or deference to his elder companion, John remained stooping at the door. Meanwhile Peter, having arrived at the tomb, entered, characteristically, without any hesitation, and began a close and attentive inspection [3] of the contents of the sepulchre. And first, his inspection confirms what had struck John. He, too, beheld "the linen cloths lying". But another and yet more striking detail caught his attention: "The napkin, that was upon his head," he informs his companion, was "not lying with the linen cloths," where it surely would have been had there been any hasty disturbance of the body, but he sees it "rolled up in a place by itself." Two words here fail to convey to the English reader the force which is found in the original. When Peter tells John that the

[1] *The Risen Master*, p. 42.

[2] A. Beard, in *The Risen Master*, p. 3. The Rev. Arthur Beard, Vicar of Greenford, was the author of a pamphlet, *The Parable of the Grave-Clothes*, to which Mr. Latham acknowledges his indebtedness for the earlier chapters of *The Risen Master*.

[3] θεωρεῖ (*theōrei*), beholdeth, *gazeth*, a stronger word than βλέπει (*blepei*), *seeth*, just used of S. John, which merely implies a general view of what met his eye.

napkin is "rolled up", he does not represent the picture, usually present to an English reader, of a napkin neatly folded twice or thrice and laid down flat, but, to quote Mr. Latham again:—"The word used for 'rolled up' ἐντετυλιγμένον [*entetuligmenon*] is employed (Matthew xxvii. 59, and Luke xxiii. 53) to express the wrapping of the Lord's body in the linen cloths, and it implies here that the napkin had been wrapped round the head and partially retained the annular form thus given it; I take it to mean that it was *not* folded so as to lie flat like the cloths." [1]

The other word to which I refer, χωρίς (*chōris*), does not appear in our English versions, unless indeed it be intended by the two words "by itself"—the napkin was "rolled up in a place by itself". But the word which may be intended by this translation has even a stronger force, signifying *apart* or *separately*. "What the Evangelist means I believe to be, that the napkin was separated from the rest of the clothes, and lay 'by itself' on the raised part of the ledge, where there was nothing else." [2] What, therefore, is conveyed in the original may be best expressed in the words of Mr. Latham:—"When the body was laid in the tomb, the head would have rested upon the raised portion of the ledge at the far end which served for a pillow. If the body exhaled or evanesced as I suppose it to have done, the napkin, which had been twisted round the top of the head would remain on this elevated slab;

[1] H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 43.
[2] H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 43.

there it would be found 'rolled up in a place by itself.'" [1]

John now enters into the sepulchre, "and he saw, and believed." He saw (εἶδε, *eide*), a different word from either of those previously used, fuller and stronger. He saw, that is, he knew, he took in the whole situation, which forced conviction upon his soul, and he believed. "John saw all this, and understood that the Lord had risen, *because the grave-clothes were undisturbed*, and on this evidence he believed." [2]

Now let me draw the reader's attention to the words with which the narrative of this visit concludes:—"So the disciples went away again unto their own home." Can any unprejudiced reader, I ask, accept these words as true and yet deny that these two Apostles entered this sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection, saw that it was empty of everything save the grave-clothes and, from the disposition of these, understood and believed that the Lord was risen? Is it possible to believe that, were it otherwise, they would have thus quietly departed to their own home? Could they have thought that the body had been removed by the Jewish rulers or the Roman soldiers and not repaired to Joseph or Nicodemus to use their influence to have that restored which had already been freely given by Pilate to Jesus' disciples? Could they have thought that friends or disciples of Jesus had removed the body to some securer place of burial

[1] H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 36. The reader ought not to fail to consult Mr. Latham's valuable note B, p. 89.

[2] A. Beard, in *The Risen Master*, p. 3.

and not have hurried instantly to find out who had removed and where they had laid it to rest? Yet they did none of these things. They betray no unrest, no anxiety, no distress; but, on the contrary, depart in quietness to their own homes.

Now, with all this narrative before us, what do critics mean when they declare, as, for example, does Professor K. Lake, that the empty tomb "is historically insufficiently accredited"? [1] Is S. John no sufficient witness, was he unable to observe, incompetent to write? Are his words to be taken merely as idle tales, an accretion of legendary fables which the Apostles deliberately chose to write down in preference to the assured memory of his own experience? Critics, no doubt, have denied the witness of S. John; but have they ever disproved it? It ill suits their theories to have so calm, so painstaking, so scrupulous, a search of the empty tomb made by two Apostles of the Lord, and recorded by one of them, and delivered into our possession as a first-hand evidence that, while the grave-clothes remained unrolled and undisturbed, the body that had lain within them was nowhere to be found. If testimony such as this is not to be received, what testimony is there which can be expected to command the assent of the understanding of any one?

[1] K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 253.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RISEN LORD.

"They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."—John xx. 13.

MEANTIME, where was Mary Magdalene? We left her at the home of the two Apostles when they rushed forth to verify her tidings respecting the empty tomb. Had she been able to keep pace with them, it is hardly probable that her inclination would have made her as fleet of foot. Already depressed with grief at the awful death of her Lord and Saviour, a grief now intensified by the mysterious removal of the sacred body, her silent sorrow, it is probable, would retard rather than hasten her returning steps to ascertain the truth of what she was already too sadly convinced. Therefore, I take it, that by the time of her reaching the sepulchre again she found the place deserted. Weeping, she drew nigh to the tomb, and "as she wept, she stooped and looked into the tomb; and she beholdeth two angels in white sitting, one at the head, and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." These angels address her: "Woman, why weepest thou?" and when she had answered: "Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him", "she turned

herself back, and beholdeth Jesus standing." One word, "Mary", dissipates the misapprehension which had taken Him for the gardener, and one word expresses her joyful recognition, "Rabboni", my Master.

Now the words which follow have been made by interpreters the cardinal difficulty in tracing the order of events of the Resurrection morning. In themselves, taken literally as our Lord spoke them, they ought not to be, nor are they, an occasion of any difficulty whatever. But expositors, for various reasons, have, I will not say misinterpreted, rather they have deliberately mistranslated words throughout the entire passage—in the prohibition, the affirmation, and the command which the words contain. They are these :—"Touch me not [marg., Take not hold on me] ; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father : but go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." [1]

(1) Here, first, the prohibition, "Touch me not", is exchanged for, "Detain me not", or, as the Revisers' margin, "Take not hold on me". Now this is a simple mistranslation. Although the word ἅπτομαι (*haptomai*) does in classical Greek sometimes, but even then only in a secondary sense, bear the meaning, *hold*, or *detain*, it is absolutely contrary to the fact to say that it is ever so rendered in the New Testament. Here it is to be found thirty-six times, in every one of which our translators have properly rendered it *touch*. Why, then, so much labour expended in the vain endeavour to establish

[1] John xx. 17, R.V.

a meaning in this place that is unknown and unattempted in thirty-five other passages? I answer, Simply because expositors, supposing an inconsistency between the "Touch me not" spoken to Mary and the permission accorded to other women, as S. Matthew relates, to take hold of His feet,[1] have no scruple, if only they can remove it, to substitute a word of their own for the word used by the Lord Himself. This glaring presumption occasions them no hesitation if only they can escape the natural inference from Christ's own words, that what He refused to one and permitted to others, was refused before He had ascended to His Father and granted after that ascent had been made.[2]

(2) For the same reason, they do not hesitate to change the tense of the Lord's words to bend them to their own misconception. The present tense, which our Lord employs, "I ascend" or, *am ascending* "unto my Father", signifying that He was then actually at the moment on His way thither, these expositors convert into a future, *I am going to ascend, I intend to ascend, I will ascend* forty days hence, determining on their own responsibility, with no Scriptural warrant whatever, that until the fortieth day had arrived, the Lord, though in His risen and glorified body, must still be bound to tread the sacred fields of Palestine.[3]

[1] Matt. xxviii. 9.

[2] See further on this point, ch. xiv, p. 216 ff.

[3] I commend to the reader the following acute remarks from Macmillan's *The One Volume Bible Commentary*, on S. Luke xxiv. 26:—"'Ought [Behoved, R.V.], not Christ', More exactly, 'Ought not the Messiah' (in consequence of the prophecies) 'to have suffered these things and to have entered into His

(3) There is furthermore in the command a mistranslation adopted with easy confidence by the same expositors :—" Go unto my brethren " is the Lord's direction. " Go to My Apostles, disciples", is the substitute which they put into His sovereign lips.[1] I can easily understand that this limitation of the word brethren to His brothers, the younger sons of our Lord's mother, may be resented by many, who will maintain that He intended Mary to understand it in the wider sense, in which the word soon after His Ascension came to be applied to all the members of the Church of Christ, as indeed S. John uses it in Chapter xxi. 23 :—" Then went this saying abroad among the [not, however, My] brethren." But though our Lord once and again used this word to indicate the fraternity that should exist in His Church ; as, for example, in Matt. xxiii. 8, when He says to His disciples, " All ye are brethren ", and again, in Luke xxii. 32, R.V., when, predicting to Peter the recovery from his fall, He

glory ? ' This passage supports the view that Jesus entered into glory not at the Ascension, but at the Resurrection. The Greek implies that the entering into glory was already past, and the phrase ' His glory ' implies that the glory was complete. Probably our Lord was in heaven during the Forty Days, descending to earth for occasional interviews."

For this reason, if I am not hypercritical, I think the phrase " the forty days spent by our Lord upon the earth between His Resurrection and Ascension," as used by a distinguished theologian (W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 200) is a mistake. Dr. Sparrow Simpson's words are much nearer the truth : " Hence (from the appearances of the Lord) the suggestion that His ordinary dwelling during the long intervals between the occasional appearances was not Jerusalem or Galilee, but the other world. '—*The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p 91.

[1] See below, ch. xiv, p. 219 ff.

tells him, "When once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren"; these instances do not indicate that the word was used as a title for Christ's disciples generally. The same remark applies to the answer of Christ upon being told (Matt. xii. 49, R.V.) that His mother and His brethren were seeking Him:—"He stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold, my mother and my brethren!" This, as His next words show, is intended to mark the spiritual kinship in which Christ and His true disciples are knit together: "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." There does not, however, seem to be any proof that the word brethren came into use as an appellation for the members of the Church before the Lord's final departure from this earth. Throughout this Gospel of S. John it is used four times of His own kindred, John ii. 12; vii. 3, 5, 10; and in Acts i. 14, 15, R.V. we find it in the same sense. And in these words to Mary, in the absence of any intimation to the contrary, it seems the sounder, as it is the more natural reading to make the reference to be to our Lord's own brothers, the sons of His mother.[1]

[1] I must refer those of my readers who cannot bear to part with the long-cherished tradition (though only dating from the fourth century) of the perpetual virginity of the mother of the Lord, to the learned and convincing discussion of this subject by the Rev. J. B. Mayor, prefixed to his commentary on the Epistle of S. James (p. xxxv f.). Here I may be allowed to quote his summary of the argument for believing that the brothers of the Lord were undoubtedly the sons of Mary and Joseph: "But where every conceivable barrier has been placed in the

The succeeding words:—"Mary Magdalene cometh and telleth the disciples, I have seen the Lord; and how that he had said these things unto her", I do not take to be a contradiction of this, as if she had understood the brethren to mean the disciples. With such stupendous tidings, her first movement would naturally be to the home of the disciples, probably to that of the two to whom she had so recently carried the news of the empty tomb. Having, then, told the disciples that she had seen Jesus, and what charge she had received, "How that he had said these things unto her", she would proceed to seek out His brothers, to deliver to them the message of His love. How natural that the love and tenderness of the Risen Saviour should number His own kith and kin among the first of those to experience the power of the Resurrection—a Peter, the Magdalene, His Brethren.

It is important to bear in mind the value of this visit of Mary Magdalene as a separate factor in the evidence for the empty tomb. To minimize its

way of this interpretation [that the brothers were sons of Joseph by a former marriage] by the frequent mention of brothers of the Lord, living with His mother and in constant attendance upon her; when He is called her first-born son, and when St. Matthew goes into what we might have been inclined to think almost unnecessary detail in fixing a limit to the separation between husband and wife; can we characterise it otherwise than as a contumacious setting up of an artificial tradition above the written Word, if we insist upon it that 'brother' must mean, not brother, but either cousin or one who is no blood-relation at all; that 'first-born' does not imply other children subsequently born; that the limit fixed to separation does not imply subsequent union?"

See below, ch. xiv, p. 219 ff.

weight, no pains have been spared by the critics to discredit the narrative by representing it as a confused or blundering version of the first visit made by the women,[1] which was considered in Chapter VI.

Now, nothing can be plainer than the fact that Mary cannot have been with her companions when the angel at the sepulchre appeared to them. Had she been with them, she could not have mentioned to the two Apostles the disappearance of the Lord's body, omitting all mention of the angel's explanation :—" He is not here ; for he is risen." Nor could she have been present while the same Apostles were making their inspection of the tomb. For had she been, it is difficult to understand their departure without any mention of any attempt on their part to explain to her the result of that inspection. So far, we rely on the evidence of the Evangelist S. John himself. From this point we rest on that furnished to the same Evangelist by Mary ; for, as he relates, she " cometh and telleth the disciples ". What she related and what the Evangelist, under the guidance, as I take it, of the Holy Spirit, has preserved of her narrative is of the weightiest value as evidence. She was weeping, she told the Apostles, and so stood before the door

[1] Thus Mr. Thompson writes :—" S. John's account seems to be an attempt to combine a number of different stories into a single strongly evidential narrative."—*Miracles in the N. T.*, p. 190. Reading this passage with its context, one cannot repress the question, Am I, then, to transmute the sacred narrative of Mary Magdalene into an unmeaning medley of fiction and fraud, the work of some early forger who chose to adopt for its author the name of the Beloved Apostle John ?

See also Prof. K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 183.

of the sepulchre. What language could better express the depth of her conviction, formed yet earlier in the morning and strengthened in her sad and solitary walk to and from the Apostles' home, that the tomb was empty. Nevertheless, so the narrative proceeds, " as she wept, she stooped and looked into the tomb ". She must make one more effort, make a minuter scrutiny, to satisfy herself that the body of her Lord had indeed been taken away. On doing so " she beholdeth two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." There is not a particle of reason to doubt that these words convey Mary's own tale to the Apostles. Do they betray the least sign of a terrorized, bewildered, stupefied woman from whose mind panic had obliterated everything that she had seen ? Two angels, they were seated, " one at the head, and one at the feet". The grave-clothes, too, though she does not mention them, must have met her gaze, for these angels were seated " where the body of Jesus had lain." She has not forgotten their words. They addressed her : " Woman, why weepest thou ? " Nor had the words of her reply escaped her recollection : " Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." She is even careful to note the minute variation in her words to the angels from those with which she made known her sorrowful tidings to the Apostles so shortly before. To them, it was " The Lord " ; to the angels, it became " my Lord ".

Perhaps what most surprises one in studying the criticisms of these angelic appearances is the purely

gratuitous assumption that either the women who saw, or the Apostles who related what they saw, were unable to distinguish the difference between the numbers one and two. If Mary's companions, who first visited the tomb, were able to distinguish the one angel whom they beheld, why should Mary Magdalene be judged incapable of recognizing two, when two appeared to her? Mr. Latham prefers to consider these angels as men because he cannot discover any adequate reason for angelic interposition in this place.[1] Professor Lake goes further when he tells us, they "are quite functionless. They do nothing and tell nothing."[2] But, whatever other reasons there may be for the intervention of angels, there is one which, to my mind, seems adequate to account for their presence. If the appearance of two angels to Mary does nothing else, assuredly it serves the purpose of making a complete distinction and difference between the three visits of women to the sepulchre recorded by the four Evangelists—the visit of the two, or perhaps three, women mentioned in Matthew and Mark; the visit of "other women", in Luke; and this, of Mary Magdalene, in John. I cannot forbear recognizing the hand of God in this difference of numbers, contributing materially to the evidence for the Christian's faith in the Resurrection, against the perverse and obstinate incredulity of human criticism. As though He foresaw the attempts to discredit His Evangelists and to mar the evidence of the eyewitnesses whose testimony they recorded,

[1] H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 399.
[2] K. Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 134.

God Himself commissions one angel to one group of women and two to others, that in the mouth of two or more witnesses, " by divers portions and in divers manners ", the evidence for the glorious fact may be fully and clearly established ; and that no man may say that the facts related by the women who saw the one angel are the same as those told by others who beheld two angels, whether these be Mary Magdalene or the other women who came to the tomb after her departure.

I do not, however, forget that the evidence of these women themselves is impugned, that they are said not to have been in a condition to give a true and clear account of what they saw. Critics declare that " The evidence of the women themselves is not of the kind which creates confidence in their exact recollection of what they heard, or of their power to distinguish this recollection from their subsequently reached interpretation of it " ; that " They were naturally in an overwrought state of mind " ; that " They did not really hear anything quite distinctly." [1] All this may be true of some, under certain circumstances ; but, I submit, we have no substantial reason for thinking that it applies to any of those women who related what they beheld at the empty tomb. Their several reports betray no marks of hesitation or inconsistency ; on the contrary, as I have just shown, that of Mary Magdalene, in its artlessness and simplicity, manifests a truthful reproduction of all that she had seen and heard. Gilbert West, to whom I have

[1] See Prof. K. Lake's *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 247–8.

referred in a former chapter,[1] adduces ten particulars of which the angel's speech to the women is composed. And the argument which he founds upon this is so forcible and so much to the point that I cannot forbear giving it here at length: "The order and connexion of which several particulars" writes West "are no less remarkable than their number; and therefore, taking both these considerations into the account, I leave any one to judge whether it be conceivable that women, under so great a terror and distraction of mind, as to fancy they saw and heard an angel when there was no such thing, should be able to compose a speech for this phantom of their fear and imagination, containing so much matter, order, and reason, and proceeding upon the supposition that they were not then convinced that Christ was risen from the dead, though the belief of his resurrection is presumed not only to have *preceded*, but even to have *occasioned* this illusion."[2]

If it be objected that the appearance of angels would be enough so to disquiet and disqualify these women from accurately observing what was going on around them, I answer, that this objection cannot be made by critics who maintain that they were men, not angels, whom the women beheld. But if it be held, as I undoubtedly hold, that they were angels who appeared to the women, still I maintain that none of the words in which the Evangelists relate the effect of their appearance upon the women necessarily imply such a state of panic

[1] Ch. vi, p. 110. See also ch. xiv, p. 214.

[2] Gilbert West, *Observations on the Resurrection*, § xiii, pp. 75–6.

or terror as to unnerve or disqualify the women who beheld them from giving a rational account of what they saw and heard. Wonder, amazement, awe, reverential fear, are all spoken of; but no word signifying panic or terror is to be found.

I conclude, therefore, that no adequate reason can be assigned for doubting the absolute historicity of this report, either as given by Mary Magdalene to the Apostles, or as handed down to us in His Gospel by the Apostle John.[1]

[1] Weighing carefully all the details of this visit as they are recorded by S. John (himself, as we have seen, almost certainly one of those who heard Mary's tidings when she came and told "the disciples" "I have seen the Lord; and how that he had said these things unto her"), the conjecture of Dr. Salmon appears to me wholly unwarrantable. He thinks it best "To regard St. John as having skilfully used the hint which Matthew furnished" (*The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 530). Why must we suppose the Evangelist preferred the account of another to his own recollections of this eventful morning? Still less are we to suppose that his memory permitted him to confound the appearance and the words of Mary to the Apostles with the advent and tidings of the company of women who came afterwards.

CHAPTER IX.

OTHER WOMEN AT THE TOMB.

"They entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." —Luke xxiv. 3.

It could not have been long after the departure of Mary when a company of other women entered the garden. Their arrival marks the fourth, out of five visits to the sepulchre recorded by the Evangelists, and the particulars of this visit are given to us only by S. Luke.

It is not easy to understand what appears to be a somewhat unreasoning objection to the distinctiveness of these five visits. Modern critics especially find fault with it. Thus, Professor K. Lake designates the "multiplication of the visits of the women to the tomb" as an "extravagance"[1], but it is hard to discover in his pages any solid reason for the assertion. For those, indeed, who are content to take for Scripture the chips from a German workshop selected and shortened and pieced together by modern artificers supposing themselves to be theological experts, it is an easy matter to make the Scriptures, not only to mean, but even to be, whatever these artificers choose. They

[1] *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 207.

are content to cut and hack the Sacred Writings as it suits them, by a process to which no other book in the world is, or ever has been, subjected by any critic whatsoever. For myself, I prefer a process more in accordance with true theology and exact science. I can deal with Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as real authors of their several works as they lie before me, in such a plain and intelligible fashion as it is impossible to use with the floating tradition and phantom authors who are supposed by the critics to stand behind the Gospels, and to change their substance at the ever-varying bidding of each succeeding critic.

All I ask, then, is an honest examination, no matter how careful, how scrutinizing, of that which lies before us.

Let me first give S. Luke's narrative as it is found in the Revised Version, the marginal notes being included in brackets in the text, Luke xxiii. 55—xxiv. 10, R.V. :—

(55) And the women, which had come with him out of Galilee, followed after, and beheld the tomb, and how his body was laid. (56) And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments. And on the sabbath they rested according to the commandment. (1) But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared. (2) And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. (3) And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus [some ancient authorities omit *of the Lord Jesus*]. (4) And it came to pass, while they were perplexed thereabout, behold,

two men stood by them in dazzling apparel : (5) and as they were affrighted, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living [Gr., *him that liveth*] among the dead ? (6) He is not here, but is risen [some ancient authorities omit *He is not here, but is risen*] : remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, (7) saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. (8) And they remembered his words, (9) and returned from the tomb [some ancient authorities omit *from the tomb*], and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. (10) Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James : and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles."

Now let me call attention to such points of difference between this account of S. Luke and the narrative common to S. Matthew and S. Mark as compel us to pronounce the two to be separate events, differing in time, and persons, and circumstances.

(1) The women in the two accounts are expressly stated to be different. The two Maries and Salome are declared by S. Mark to have made their purchases on the Saturday evening. For S. Mark xvi. 1 is truly rendered by the Revisers in the preterite " bought " and not by the pluperfect " had bought " as in our Authorized Version.[1] Now if we examine S. Luke's words (xxiii. 56) where he tells us that the women of whom he is

[1] See above, ch. v, p. 92 f.

about to write "prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment", we see clearly that the two Maries and Salome, who bought their spices on the Saturday evening, cannot be included among the women of S. Luke, who made their purchases on the evening before, that is, before sundown on Friday evening.

(2) The next essential difference between the two narratives, we find in what is said as to the entering of the women into the tomb. According to S. Matthew, the women, before entering into the tomb, were accosted by the angel: "Come, see the place where the Lord lay." S. Mark's account does not contradict this, for though he states that "entering into the tomb, they saw a young man", we need understand by this nothing more than their standing in the entrance into the tomb; for, lower down, the angel addressed them: "Behold, the place where they laid him!" On the other hand, S. Luke's narrative describes the women as entering directly into the sepulchre, and, since they "found not the body of the Lord Jesus", we infer that they had searched for it, and so, in their disappointment, and before seeing any angel, "they were" as S. Luke says "perplexed thereabout", that is, they were bewildered, in doubt, could make nothing of it. The entering, therefore, of the women is decidedly different in each narrative.

(3) In the narrative common to S. Matthew and S. Mark only one angel (S. Mark, "young man") appeared to the women. S. Luke tells us that while the women were standing in the sepulchre perplexed, "behold, two men stood by them in

dazzling apparel." What I have said in the preceding chapter as to the perfect competency of the women to distinguish and tell whether they saw one or two angels, is equally applicable here. If the Divine commission had appointed one angel to appear to one company of women and two angels to appear to another, is it not absolutely inexcusable to declare without any reason that the difference in numbers is due to a mistake, either of the women who saw the vision or of the Evangelists who report their story? If both these be trustworthy, such an interpretation falsifies rather than explains the history.

And that they were both trustworthy, we gather incidentally from S. Luke's narrative of the two disciples who were joined by the Lord in their walk to Emmaus, a narrative, be it observed, in all probability received at first hand by S. Luke from one or both of these disciples. Cleopas tells the Lord that certain women of their company had, early that morning, visited the sepulchre, where they had seen a vision of angels, "which said that he was alive." Cleopas here could not refer to Mary Magdalene, for to her the angels did not utter a word as to the Lord, alive or dead; neither could he refer to the visit of Mary and Salome, for they had only seen "AN ANGEL", and not, as these, "a vision OF ANGELS."[1] Here, then, is an

[1] Disproving Wieseler's assertion that "The general correspondence between John xx. 1–11 and the narrative Lu. xxiv. 1–11 is so complete in all essential particulars that there can be no doubt as to their identity."—Karl Wieseler, *A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (tr. by Rev. E. Venables), p. 390.

incidental, and therefore most valuable, testimony confirming the direct narrative of S. Luke with which we are dealing.

(4) In the fourth place, Matthew and Mark agree in telling us that the angel gave a certain commission to the two (or perhaps, three) women, to be delivered to the Apostles: "Go, tell his disciples [and, added by S. Mark] and Peter." S. Luke, on the contrary, speaks of no commission. The women whom the two angels address are simply told by them: "Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again." This citation refers to Luke ix. 22.

(5) In the next place, a most important difference is to be observed in the words spoken by the angels in the two narratives. In that common to S. Matthew and S. Mark, the commission entrusted by the angel to the women is, to repeat to the Apostles certain words spoken by the Lord to the Eleven only, on the Thursday night, in or near the Garden of Gethsemane, just before His betrayal: "He goeth before [προάγει, *proagei*] you."[1] To this the angels in S. Luke make no reference. They, we are distinctly told, bid the women: "Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee", that is to say, months before the incident recalled by the angel of the first two Evangelists.

The significance of this last particular will appear more clearly if we suppose for an instant

[1] See above, ch. vi, p. 114 ff.

a transposition of the words recited in S. Luke to the narratives in the first two Evangelists and, vice versa, that the words recited in those Gospels be transposed to the narratives in S. Luke. In the first instance, how vapid and meaningless will appear the direction to repeat to the Apostles some words spoken months previously. And when we remember the special message to Peter, what can compensate for the loss of the words spoken c
night of the betrayal, recalling his vain
boast followed quickly by his denial, at t
time foreshadowing the forgiveness of the
ing and unchangeable Master? On
hand, if we transpose the words of th
in the first two Gospels to the narrativ
the change makes the passage, not c
less, but absolutely unintelligible, not
In this case the women would be told to remember words spoken two nights before, words not addressed to them, words which they never heard! In what sense, then, could the concluding words of the Evangelist be true, "They remembered his words"?

(6) One more difference may be pointed out. The opening words of the angel as recorded by S. Matthew and S. Mark are consolatory: "Fear not ye" (Matthew), "Be not amazed" (Mark). What is spoken by the angel in S. Luke is a question: "Why seek ye the living [Gr., *him that liveth*] among the dead?" The importance of this difference will be seen when we come to consider the visit of S. Peter to the tomb recorded by S. Luke (xxiv. 12). This visit must have followed

the recital of the angel's words by the women in S. Luke, not that by the women in S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. John; for these latter were asked no such question and saw one angel only.

Here, then, we have six particulars on which we must base our answer to the question, Are we to consider these three narratives as only three versions of one and the same event, or, as two versions, [illegible]ree writers, of two separate and distinct [illegible]? In other words, Is the narrative common [illegible]tthew and S. Mark the history of one event, [illegible]uke's that of another; or, are all three [illegible] and the same thing?

[illegible], I must say that I cannot conceive ho[illegible]-minded unprejudiced reader, having before [illegible]hese six differences—differences so many an[illegible] marked—could refuse to accept the conclusion that there are two separate events spoken of. The very prominence attached to the several points of difference by the sacred writers: distinguishing the women; marking their respective entrances into the sepulchre; the number of angels, different in each case; a command to one set of women, to the other, an exhortation; most important of all, the recital of two different Scriptures, singularly telling as they stand, but absolutely unintelligible if interchanged; and lastly, the word of comfort spoken by the angel in the one case, as contrasted with the question addressed by the angels in the other—all these must of necessity compel the conviction that it is impossible to identify the event recorded by S. Luke with that recorded by S. Matthew

and S. Mark. The two accounts bear such differences as to make it absurd to assert that either is a confused or blundering version of the other. And instead of numbering the multiplication of the women at the sepulchre among the extravagances of interpretation, I should hold that the "extravagance" lies with those critics who deliberately shut their eyes to the presence of such patent differentiæ, or else attempt to explain these away by the invention of what they call a Judæan tradition.[1]

Let us return to S. Luke's history. He tells us that these women "returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest." If we ask, What things? it is interesting to take the answer from the words of Cleopas just referred to. At first we might think it was only that they had seen a vision of angels which said that Jesus was alive; but reading still further, the words addressed to the Lord by Cleopas, we gather the possibility of something more having been added. His words are: "And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him

[1] As does Prof. K. Lake (*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 92):—"This incident might well be merely a paraphrastic amplification of Mark, if it were not for the mention of the 'two men' in place of 'the young man.' This seems to point to the probability that another tradition than Mark is being followed, and, if so, the examination of the tomb implied by the words, 'they did not find' may also be due to this source."

To the common-sense reader of the New Testament the puzzle occasioned by such criticism as this, is Why the veracity of either S. Mark or S. Luke needs correction by tradition of any sort, Galilæan, Judæan, or any other that may be invented

they saw not." Now these words at first sight strike us, not, indeed, as a contradiction, but certainly as qualifying S. Luke's direct statement (xxiv. 11) :—" These words [of the women] appeared in their sight as idle talk ; and they disbelieved them." For, first, some at any rate, according to Cleopas, were induced by them to visit the sepulchre, which they found " even so as the women had said." This part, therefore, of the women's story was confirmed as true. The body was not there. But now comes the further remarkable statement of Cleopas : " But him they saw not." Why, we ask, should a vision of the Lord have been expected, as the words of Cleopas evidently suggest, if these women had spoken only of seeing angels ? If this were so, would not the more natural conclusion be " But angels they saw not " ? In other words, Although the women said they saw angels yet when our friends went to the sepulchre they saw no angels ; everything else was as the women stated, only there were no angels within. Instead of this, however, it is, *Jesus we saw not.* Now, how are we to account for this substitution ; what could have suggested it ? One answer only seems to be possible, That, besides the vision of angels of which they spoke, they must also have spoken of seeing the Lord Himself, but that this seeing Jesus was included by the disciples in the vision of angels of which the women spake, and all set down as " idle talk " to which they could give no credence.

Archdeacon Townson has so clearly expressed this view that I cannot do better than give his

own words for the benefit of those who may not have ready access to his *Discourses on the Four Gospels*:—"Cleopas, I think, discovers indirectly that he had heard what the women declared concerning the appearance of Christ to them. He mentions two things reported by them; one, that they found not his body; and another, that they had seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive. He subjoins, that some of their company going to the sepulchre perceived the first part of the report to be true. But of the second what does he say? We expect to hear 'But the angels they saw not:' instead of which his words are 'But Him they saw not.' Why this expectation of seeing Him, grounded on the testimony of the women, unless it had been part of their testimony, that Him they had seen?"[1]

It only remains to make a remark or two on S. Luke's summing up of the visit of these women, which he gives in verse 10. If the reader will lay the Authorized and Revised Versions side by side before him, he will perceive that the Revisers have made a very remarkable change. They give verse 10 as follows:—"Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles." As the Authorized Version gives this verse, we are told that the women who "returned from the Sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest" were the women severally enumerated in the tenth verse of the Authorized Version:—"It was Mary

[1] T. Townson, *Discourses on the Four Gospels*, p. 408.

Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the Apostles."[1]

I think any one making this comparison for the first time will conclude that, according to the Revised Version, S. Luke intended his readers to understand, first, that he wrote of two different companies of women, the three whom he names and those whom he describes as "the other women"; and, secondly, that it was these other women who, having visited the sepulchre and seen the two angels, returned to the Eleven, to whom they told these things. And this, I think, is precisely what S. Luke did intend. There are, however, two words in the passage which may be thought to make this interpretation doubtful. They are the two words "with them". It will be necessary therefore to inquire more particularly what possible meaning may be assigned to these words before we arrive at a certain conclusion.

(1) Of the three women whom S. Luke mentions, two of them, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother

[1] This is a translation (apparently through the Vulgate) of Greek copies whose writers changed S. Luke's plural, "Now they were" (ἦσαν δὲ, *ēsan de*) into the singular, *It was* (ἦν, *ēn*), and inserted *which* (αἵ, *hai*) before, "told these things unto the Apostles." This was done to show that it was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, as well as other women, who told these things unto the Apostles. The Revisers, however, as may be seen, have gone back to S. Luke's own words, which most probably indicate that while the three women named had visited the sepulchre (when, the Evangelist does not specify), they were other women, of whom he had been speaking in the preceding narrative, who told these things unto the Apostles.

of James, S. Mark tells us, as we have already seen, bought the spices on the day succeeding to the Sabbath, that is, some time between sundown on Saturday evening and early dawn on Sunday. But S. Luke tells us (xxiii. 56) that the women whose visit to the sepulchre he is about to narrate "returned, and prepared spices and ointments. And on the sabbath they rested according to the commandment", that is, they made their preparations before sundown on Friday evening. Unless, therefore, we are willing to charge S. Luke with contradicting himself, it is impossible to hold that women who bought spices after sundown on Saturday evening did the things which, he tells us, were done by women who completed their preparations on the preceding evening.

(2) Again, it seems in the highest degree improbable, if not impossible, that the women whom S. Luke names should have brought their tidings to the Apostles at the same time with the other women, who met the two angels in the sepulchre. For Mary the mother of James, and, presumably, Joanna, together with Salome, having received directions from the angel whom they saw in the sepulchre, had departed quickly to bring the Apostles word. When they were gone, Peter and John, and, after them, Mary Magdalene, visited the tomb, where she was addressed by two angels and, immediately after, by the Lord Himself. Mary then departed to the disciples. All this intervening before the arrival of the second group of women, it seems in the highest degree improbable, we might almost say impossible, that in the one

case, Mary the mother of James with Joanna and Salome, in the other, Mary Magdalene, could have made their several reports at the same time as the other women whose visit is recorded by S. Luke.[1] For these two reasons, therefore, I find it impossible to take the two words "with them" as signifying at the same time and in company with the three women named.

We must take the words "with them", not as indicating that the other women *and* the three just mentioned told these things to the Eleven; but rather as in close connexion with and defining "the other women", and signifying that these "other women" were of the company of the three just named, belonging to them, all being among the number of the women who "had come with Jesus out of Galilee" (xxiii. 55).[2]

[1] "S. Luke joined Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, together, not because they all reported the same thing to the Apostles, but for a higher reason, because they severally attested different things in such a manner, that the amount of their testimonies was the whole of the evidence that could then be exhibited."—T. Townson, *Discourses on the Four Gospels*, p. 397.

[2] There is another sense in which the preposition *with* might be taken, and which appears tempting since it is employed by S. Luke in this very chapter. In verse 21 σὺν (*sun*), *with*, is translated "beside" in both versions:—"Yea and beside all this, it is now the third day," etc.; as Winer (*Gram. of N.T. Gr.*, p. 488) explains it, "*Joined with all this there is the fact that etc.*" This is also the sense in which the preposition "with" is found in Acts xvii. 34:—"Among whom also was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them", that is, *others besides, in addition to them*. Thus it would be in accordance with a use of S. Luke to explain the verse before us *and the other women, beside them*, i.e., in addition to the two Maries and Joanna, who had already told their stories to the Apostles

We have now followed step by step the history of this visit to the sepulchre recorded by S. Luke; and if the result of our inquiry be accepted, it will be easily seen that S. Luke himself becomes a witness of the first importance not only for the independence of his narrative, but also for the fact of the visit itself. He records a visit of certain women to the sepulchre, but, implicitly, also vouches for an earlier visit, by the women of S. Matthew and S. Mark.

One other observation I must make before I close this chapter. Negative criticism perpetually harps upon the existence of a Galilæan and a Judæan tradition, said to be relied upon now by one and now by another of the Evangelists. Great stress is laid upon the fact that here S. Luke is indebted to the Judæan tradition. There is, however, another standpoint from which this question can be quite as historically viewed. We shall have studied S. Luke's history to little purpose if we fail to recognize a peculiar fitness in the choice made by the several Evangelists of the visit which each records. S. Matthew, an Apostle of the Lord, writing for the Jews in Palestine, concerns himself with those women whose names were so familiar to him and the readers for whom his work was designed. S. Mark, though writing for a wider circle, yet, as brought up in Jerusalem and an early disciple, naturally dwells with affection and interest upon the names so long and so familiarly known to him, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome. The Evangelist who seizes so graphically the minute yet striking details of his history;

the " pillow " upon which the Lord slept throughout the tempest, the " green grass " where the multitude were set down ; would not be likely to pass by the incident in which these women were the actors. On the other hand, S. Luke, writing for a still wider circle of Gentile readers and with no personal recollections to influence him one way or the other, relates a history which probably excited a wider interest and left a more lasting impression than one confined to a narrower circle, of four women and the company of the Eleven. Numbers, not names, more probably affected him. Not they who spoke to no one by the way, familiar as their names may have been to the Apostles and first Christians ; but the women who told what they had seen and heard to the Eleven and all the rest, so that, though disbelieved and their words taken only for idle talk, yet stirred up others to hurry again on a fifth errand to the sacred spot, and so became the topic of conversation between two disciples and the Lord Himself—theirs is the history that we naturally look for from the pen of him who " traced the course of all things accurately from the first " as he received them from those who " from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word."

CHAPTER X.

MESSENGERS OF THE RISEN LORD.

"Go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."—Matt. xxviii. 10, R.V.

"Go tell My brothers." For the second time on this Easter morning these remarkable words fell from the lips of the Risen Lord. On this occasion they were addressed by Him to a little company of women who were hastening from the garden in which the new tomb of Joseph had been hewn. Suddenly Jesus stood before them. At His greeting, "All hail", they recognized Him and "came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not: go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."

On this little episode, peculiar to S. Matthew, let me ask one question, a question so simple that because of its simplicity no one has ever thought of asking, far less of answering, it. Who were these women? "Who else" it is said "could they be but the two Maries whose visit to the tomb S. Mathew had just described, the two Maries and their companion Salome, whom S. Mark joins with them, perhaps also Joanna, mentioned by S. Luke?" So reasons the popular theology. No one thinks that the words might have been

addressed by the Risen Lord to any other women than these. Far less has it struck any one how impossible it is that these words could have been addressed to this group of women on their return from the sepulchre where the angel had told them, The Lord is risen. And yet this is really the case. It is absolutely impossible that these could be the women spoken of.

Once more we must fix our eyes upon the successive visitors to the tomb.

Mary Magdalene could not have been among this company. At the first sight of the stone rolled away and of the sepulchre bereft of the body of the Lord, she had hurried back to the house of Peter and John, again following them as they both ran to the tomb to ascertain the truth of her report: "They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him." And when again she arrived at the tomb the two Apostles had departed. Her companions, too, were no longer to be seen. They had stayed when Mary hurried back; and before her return or the arrival of the two Apostles, they had seen the angel, received his message to the Apostles, and were already on the way to deliver it. And now Mary beheld two angels, more than this, the Risen Lord Himself appeared before her and, to the warning, "Touch me not", added a first message to His kindred: "Go tell my brothers."

Thus, then, the second charge, "Go tell my brothers", could not have been spoken to Mary and Salome and Joanna; for they had departed from the garden before Mary Magdalene had

re-entered it and had there become the first to see the Risen Lord. Neither could they be this company for a further reason; since these women, charged with a message by the angel, had hastened away to the Apostles and, as S. Mark tells us, "said nothing to any one", implying, as I take it, and as all expositors seem to admit, that they met with no interruption on their way.[1]

This is a sufficient answer to West's opinion that the women who were met by the Risen Lord were the other Mary and Salome.[2]

Here, then, is a serious difficulty. How do expositors attempt to solve it?

(i) Bishop Ellicott (who holds that only one company of women visited the sepulchre) suggests that the women departed and, having seen the Apostles, returned to it again:—"It seems reasonable to suppose" writes the Bishop "that the

[1] Bishop Ellicott has some excellent observations on this point which I think it well to give:—"It seems unreasonable in Meyer (*on Mark* xvi. 8) and others to press the οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον [*oudeni ouden eipon*] of the second Evangelist, as implying that the women did not obey the angel's command, and that it was only afterwards that they mentioned it. Surely it is reasonable on psychological grounds (to borrow a favourite mode of argument in modern writers) to think that the women would not, individually, much less collectively, disobey a command of such a kind, and uttered by such a speaker. Fear sealed their lips to chance-met passers to and fro, but joy (Matth. xxviii. 8) opened them freely enough to the Apostles."—*Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (fourth ed.), p. 381, note 2.

[2] Speaking of this visit of the other Mary and Salome, West adds that "they fled from the sepulchre", "intending to communicate these things to the apostles, as the angel had commanded them", "that as they were going, Jesus Christ himself met them."—Gilbert West, *Observations on the Resurrection*, § xi, pp. 58, 59.

women would return to the sepulchre. They left it in great precipitation (ἔφυγον, *ephugon*, Mark xvi. 8), and would naturally go back again, if not for the lower purpose of fetching what they might have left there, yet for the higher one of gaining some further knowledge of a mystery which even Apostles refused to believe. Compare, thus far, Wieseler, *Chron. Synops.*, p. 425 sq."[2] [1]

To this opinion there are two objections which I regard as absolutely fatal. First, the Bishop identifies the visit of the other women, narrated by S. Luke, with that of the two Maries and Salome, recorded by the first two Evangelists. From what I have said in the previous chapter this identification is absolutely impossible.[2] The second objection to the Bishop's opinion is that it has no foundation whatever in Scripture. We have not a hint given to us that these three women on delivering the angel's message to the Apostles returned again to the sepulchre. There is no passage in any one of the four Gospels which might suggest this, even as an inference. The whole argument by which the Bishop supports it is purely hypothetical: "It seems reasonable to suppose" he says, the women who left the sepulchre "would naturally go back again", perhaps to fetch "what they might have left there." All this, however, is pure conjecture, not proof, least of all, proof from Scripture.

(ii) Another solution of the question is that put forth by Archdeacon Townson. Unlike Bishop

[1] *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (fourth ed.), p. 382, note 3.

[2] See ch. ix, p. 141 ff.

Ellicott, Townson maintains that the visit of the women reported by the first two Evangelists is distinct from that given to us by S. Luke. But keeping his eye upon S. Matthew's narrative only, he holds that Mary and Salome, after leaving the sepulchre where they had seen the angel, waited in the hope of seeing Mary Magdalene until, meeting her, they proceeded together to deliver the angel's message to the Apostles, and were met by Jesus on the way. Archdeacon Townson's own words are these :—"They therefore either waited near the gate of the garden, or went back part of the way, till they saw her hastening on that happy errand to the disciples, on which they were going ; and the joyful meeting of the three dear friends was quickly crowned with greater felicity. For, as they were going to tell the apostles what things they had heard and seen, Jesus himself met them, saying, All hail. And they came, and, as he graciously permitted them, held him by the feet, and worshipped him." [1]

Among recent writers, Professor Orr takes practically the same view as this of Archdeacon Townson, with this difference, that while the Archdeacon makes Mary Magdalene join the other Mary and Salome *before* the Lord met them, thus giving her two meetings with the Lord, Professor Orr fixes her meeting with her two companions *after* these had seen the Lord. The women who first visited the sepulchre, he writes :—"After their first hurried flight (cf. Mark xvi. 8) must have paused to regain their self-possession, . . . to consider how

[1] T. Townson, *Discourses on the Four Gospels*, p. 290.

they should proceed in conveying their tidings to the still scattered disciples. In such a pause, their hearts aflame with love and holy desire, Jesus, who a little earlier had made Himself known to Mary in the garden, appeared to them.... It is not unlikely that, before long, on her way back to the city, Mary Magdalene joined her sisters." [1]

But the objections to this are quite as strong as those against Bishop Ellicott's explanation.

In the first place, so far from lingering in or near the garden, these women, S. Matthew expressly tells us: "departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to bring his disciples word." And, if further confirmation were needed, so far from interviewing Mary Magdalene or any one else, S. Mark tells us: "they said nothing to any one" on their way to the disciples.

But Archdeacon Townson uses another argument, a negative one, to show that it must be the two Maries and Salome whom the Lord met. Speaking of the other women who, S. Luke tells us, visited the sepulchre and saw the two angels, Townson writes:—"Not a word or hint do we discover in him [Luke], that in returning from the sepulchre they beheld the Lord Himself." [2] Therefore, the Archdeacon argues, it can only be the two Maries and Salome who met the Lord and clasped His feet.

But, in answer to this, I may point out that it is to the women who beheld the two angels that Luke xxiv. 23, 24 refers, where we find the hint that in the vision of angels of which Cleopas speaks

[1] James Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 167.
[2] *Discourses on the Four Gospels*, p. 381.

an appearance of the Lord was almost certainly included.[1]

(iii) Canon Cook's explanation (in *The Speaker's Commentary*) is almost too vague to be cited: "There is, therefore, reason to assume that in this verse St. Matthew, who gives a succinct and complete summary of all appearances to the women, refers to the separate manifestation to Mary Magdalene." In his further words he seems to assume that S. Matthew's is a combined account of the appearances of the Lord to Mary Magdalene with some other that may have taken place in or near Jerusalem. The Canon, like Dean Alford, seems to think that "We may fairly require that the judgment should be suspended in lack of further means of solving the difficulty."[2]

This neutral attitude, however safe and easy it may appear, is by no means to be commended. The position given by S. Matthew to this incident in his account of the first visit to the empty tomb, demands imperatively a definite understanding of the time and place and persons intended by the writer. And we may be sure, if the "ministers of the word" pass over these as unworthy of their patient study, the adversaries will not be slow to profit by their neglect and impugn the trustworthiness of the sacred writers and discredit the truth of the Resurrection fact. If, in an incident like this, weighty though brief, as it is, the Evangelist can be caught in error, either by confusion of different narratives, by use of untrustworthy information,

[1] See above, ch. ix, p. 143 f. and 147 ff.

[2] Alford, *Comm. on the Gr. Test.*, Matt. xxviii. 9.

or by his own forgetfulness—it matters not what the cause—, the truthfulness of the history must perforce be more or less impaired. In so vital a matter as the Resurrection such a result is intolerable. On this account, I ask a close and patient investigation of every line and word that may help to solve the difficulty.

Let us, then, begin by noting how the Evangelist really introduces this incident. The Authorized Version reads it :—" And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them." Now, undoubtedly this introduction has had a great deal to say to the confusion and difficulty attending every attempt to explain the passage. It unquestionably compels the identification of the women of whom S. Matthew has just spoken as visiting the sepulchre with those who, he proceeds to declare, were met by the Risen Lord. It, further, gives precision and sequence to that which precedes and follows : As the women departed from the sepulchre and were on the way to fulfil their errand, Jesus met them.[1]

But when we turn to the Revised Version we find that this introduction has vanished, and in its place we read :—" And behold, Jesus met them."

That this represents what S. Matthew originally wrote is now generally agreed upon by scholars. It is even possible for us to understand how the

[1] In this way Dr. Sparrow Simpson seems to identify the women who saw the angel with those who met the Lord, although he recognizes this part of the narrative as consisting of two different sections :—" The first of these sections is closely connected with the second by the words, ' and as they went '."—*The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 66.

words which stand for our English: "And as they went to tell His disciples" came to be introduced into the text from which the Authorized translation was made. Some well-meaning though ill-informed scribe, thinking to make S. Matthew's meaning clearer, may have made a note on these words in the margin of his copy, other scribes following him, what was at first intended only as a note became by and by incorporated as part of the text. But, like so many similar attempts made without sufficient knowledge or authority, this meaning-to-do-well, as we see in this instance, has only led to very disastrous results. However, as we now have the passage in S. Matthew's own words, simply stating, "And behold, Jesus met them", any one can see for himself that the incident which is related is not quite so closely connected with what precedes as it appears to be when we read it in the Authorized Version.

When we take a further step we find this view strengthened. The words standing for "And behold", καὶ ἰδοὺ (*kai idou*), are of common use in the New Testament, and are not infrequently used by S. Matthew to mark the introduction of a new subject, much as is done in English books by the use of paragraphs.[1] One example may suffice to illustrate my meaning. When the Evangelist closes his report of the Sermon on the Mount, he writes: "When he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him. And behold [καὶ ἰδού (*kai idou*)], there came to him a leper and

[1] E.g., Matt. viii. 2; ix. 2, 20; xii. 10; xv. 22; xix. 16; xx. 30; xxvi. 51; xxvii. 51; xxviii. 2.

worshipped him."[1] Now the "And behold" might be, and is generally, supposed to connect the miracle, which follows with what precedes, as though the miracle were performed when Jesus came down from the mount. If, on the contrary, however, as some expositors think, a comparison of the synoptics shows us that this cure took place before, and not after, the Sermon on the Mount, the "And behold" καὶ ἰδοὺ (*kai idou*) will be found to introduce a new subject, The healing of a leper, which stands at the head of a group of miracles recorded in this and the following chapter.[2]

[1] Matt. viii. 1, 2, R.V.

[2] Matt. viii. ix.

If my view of this paragraphic force of καὶ ἰδοὺ (*kai idou*) be correct, it is a sufficient answer to Dr. Salmon's remark that S. Matthew inserted the miracle "merely to connect it with his previous subject" *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 147. So also Archd. Allen, *Comm. on S. Matt.*, viii. 1.

A further confirmation of this is to be found in the use of the well-known formula "when Jesus had ended these sayings" occurring five times in S. Matthew's Gospel (vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1). If the reader will carefully study each of these passages, he will see that this formula, or the formula together with the words to which it is prefixed, indicates in every case the conclusion of the section to which it is attached, and not the introduction to the section following. Thus xi. 1 concludes the instructions given by the Lord to the Apostles when sending them forth. Again, xiii. 53–8 concludes the section containing the seven great parables; similarly, xix. 1, 2 closes a section of parables and sayings addressed to the multitudes; and lastly, xxvi. 1, 2 winds up the section of the great discourse and parables delivered to the four Apostles on the Mount of Olives. If this be accepted in the case of these four sections, the first section before us will, similarly, conclude with the formula and succeeding words vii. 28 to viii. 1, thus making 'And behold", καὶ ἰδοὺ (*kai idou*) introduce another and unconnected section, so that chapter viii of our English versions ought to begin with verse 2 instead of verse 1.

In the same way, then, the "And behold" here, instead of connecting the history of the appearance of the Lord with that of the visit of the women to the tomb, really disconnects, and introduces it as a new instance.

We have still another word to consider before the difficulty is entirely removed. "And behold, Jesus met them." Does not the last word point to the same women of whom the Evangelist had been speaking? Under ordinary circumstances and without explanation, I would answer, Yes, certainly. Here, however, we have to consider, as well as the purport of what is written, the mind of the writer. It is plain from his narrative that the last thing that would here occupy the mind of this Evangelist would be the number or names of the women of whom he writes. Though naming the two women who started first for the sepulchre, he takes no notice either of the departure of Mary Magdalene or of the coming of Salome, and yet he writes:—"And the angel answered and said unto the women", when only one of the two whom he had named was present.[1] His only anxiety is to convey the fact that an angel appeared to certain women arrived at the tomb, whether these were identical or not with the two whose names stand at the head of his narrative. In the same way, we may, I think, legitimately conclude that his chief concern in the next instance is the appearance of the Risen Lord to women, whoever they may be. He had been speaking of the appearance of an angel to women, and then proceeds to relate the appearance of Jesus

[1] See above ch. vi, pp. 110–1 and below, ch. xii, p. 185.

Himself to women. Hence he makes use of the pronoun "them" in an indefinite rather than a definite sense.

That this is so will be further gathered if we consider who the writer is. It is the Apostle, S. Matthew, writing with a full tide of memories flowing in upon him. He was with the Eleven as the successive tidings came from the tomb on this memorable morning. The two, or possibly three women coming in haste with the angel's message, the secret token from the Master to the Apostles: "I will go before you into Galilee." And close upon these come Peter and John with the amazing tidings that the tomb was empty and the grave-clothes and napkin *in situ*, all undisturbed. Their tale perhaps hardly told when Mary Magdalene appears, to tell, not alone of angels beheld within the tomb, but of the very Lord Himself, the Risen Jesus, outside, who had spoken with her and given her a message for His brothers after the flesh. And yet others come, hurrying women—who or how many, we know not; what signified their number or their names in view of the astounding, glorious tidings they had to tell?—they, too, had seen the Lord, they had clasped His feet, they had heard His voice; they, too, bore a message to His kindred, That the brothers should depart to Galilee; there they should see their Lord and Brother alive from the dead for evermore.

Is it any wonder, I ask, that the Evangelist, writing, some thirty or forty years after, the history of these thrilling tidings spoken on this glorious Easter morning, would not be over-anxious about

names and numbers (albeit so well-remembered), provided only that he might keep before his readers his irrefutable testimony to the resurrection of the body of the Lord?

Yet all this by no means indicates that the Evangelist was confused or had forgotten who these women were. Though in his narrative the glorious presence of the Risen Lord outshines the personality of the women, it is simply inconceivable that the Apostle, to whom every face and name of those women who had followed Jesus from Galilee and had brought successively that morning their memorable tidings from the empty tomb were familiar, could have forgotten all when he was writing. His narrative, even though of the very briefest, is not without some faint traces that may serve to guide us in our quest. They were women, so much the Greek pronoun *them* indicates. The context, both that which precedes and that which follows, is strongly suggestive of the occurrence taking place in the vicinity of the sepulchre. The meeting of the women with Jesus, His words, and their departure, imperceptibly suggest that they were on their way to the Apostles. And with this clue, it will not be hard to follow up the answer to the question, Who were these women?

In the preceding chapter we discussed the visit of certain women, whose names S. Luke does not give us, who visited the tomb on that Easter morning, where they beheld two angels. The words of Cleopas telling our Lord of this visit imply, it will be remembered, that, besides this vision of angels, the women must have also spoken of having

seen the Lord. S. Luke's direct narrative would appear to confirm this :—They "returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest." [1] It was not merely that they had seen two angels, and what these angels had said to them, that they told: the "all these things" (ταῦτα πάντα, *tauta panta*) surely embraces something more, something which, though not specified by the Evangelist, is revealed to us in the words of Cleopas.

Here, then, we have the answer to our question. These are the women whose meeting with Jesus S. Matthew narrates. His concern is only with their meeting with the Lord; S. Luke's, only that of their meeting with the angels. [2]

[1] Luke xxiv. 9, R.V.

[2] This is not a solitary instance in the N. T. of the accounts of two different incidents being so merged together as to give the two the appearance of being but one. Compare S. Luke xxiv. 43 :—"And he took it, and did eat before them", followed by verse 44 :—"And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me."

Now, although Meyer insists strongly that these words of our Lord with all that follows were spoken on the evening of His Resurrection, and on the occasion closed by the words of verse 43, the eating of the boiled fish; it is more generally admitted, as stated by Alford, that "they cannot have been said *on this evening*"; but according to Steinmeyer and apparently the majority of commentators, during or at the end of the forty days before the Ascension, Steinmeyer writes :—"If any one takes up the impression that the whole of Luke xxiv. is to be regarded as contained within the course of one day, with him there can be no dispute. We, for our part, confess to the very opposite, and we justify our impression by the εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, [*eipe de autois*], ver. 44, but still more by the οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου, [*houtoi hoi logoi mou*] at the beginning, which sounds almost like a title. The charge

If this identification of the women of S. Luke with those of S. Matthew who met the Lord be admitted—and I do not see why it should be denied—what a striking proof is given to us of the absolute independence of the two Evangelists, and at the same time what a perfect freedom from all discrepancy or contradiction. Why it has not suggested itself to any expositor is surprising. To arrive at it, we have no need to strain or distort Scripture in either of the Gospels; we simply accept each Evangelist's own history, finding that each has only used the liberty accorded to every historian and taken that half of an incident which he thought best adapted to his own purpose and design. S. Matthew desired the witness of the Lord Himself in addition to the testimony of the angel, and so he takes the history of the women who told that they had seen the Lord. S. Luke, who had related the appearance of the angels to the women at the tomb, omits the subsequent appearance of the Lord to them, having to relate another appearance—that on the road to Emmaus—which bore even more directly upon their visit to the tomb. Who can say that the silence of either Evangelist is contradicted by what the other has chosen to record?

that this is a violent and arbitrary shift of Harmonistics we repudiate as wholly groundless."—*The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 353, note 1.

But if the phrase "these are my words" justifies Steinmeyer in separating verse 43 from verse 44 in S. Luke, much more are we justified in holding that S. Matthew's "And behold", in his history of the Resurrection, indicates there, as elsewhere so often, the introduction of a new and separate incident.

Now let us return to the Lord's address to these women. It takes the form of a command. It is important to note this, as so many, and modern critics especially, have inferred from it that the Apostles were directed to undertake immediately a journey into Galilee; from which is further gathered, the impossibility of these appearances of the Lord in Jerusalem which are recorded by the Evangelists and which, of course, the critics set down as unhistorical.

Let it be observed that we have no record of any such command to the Apostles by the Lord, either before or after His Resurrection. What the angel spake to the women in the sepulchre was a recital, as we have already seen, of the Lord's words to His Apostles on the night of His betrayal. They were, not a command, but simply a prediction of what the Lord Himself would do after He had risen from the dead.

No more a command, are the words recited by the two angels to the other women; but similarly, a prediction, of His sufferings, death, and resurrection, spoken in Galilee, months before, of which the angels now put the women in mind. Here, then only, is the command to go into Galilee to be found, and it is addressed by the Lord, through the women, not to His disciples or Apostles, but to "My brothers." [1]

[1] If this be admitted, it does away at once with the objection of Martineau, "That there was no need for Christ to speak if all He had to say was to repeat the message already given to go to Galilee" (W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 97); for this is a new message, and not to Apostles, but to His brothers.

I ask the reader's particular attention to the study of these words, the more so, because Dr. Sparrow Simpson, taking them as a command to the Apostles, does not hesitate to impute to the Apostles negligence and lack of obedience to the command, and in this way endeavours to evade what appears to be, as he expresses it, "Contradictions, between the message to go to Galilee, and the narratives relating Appearances in Jerusalem." It is necessary to give Dr. Sparrow Simpson's words at length:—"Is it in any way improbable that the Risen Lord's original design was to manifest Himself in Galilee, and that this intention was frustrated by His disciples' lethargy? It would not be the first time in history where the Divine plan was affected by human infirmities. In this case, the contradictions, between the message to go to Galilee, and the narratives relating Appearances in Jerusalem, are due to contradictions in the agents themselves; to conflicts between the will of Christ and the wills of His disciples. This diversity of purpose between the Master and the Twelve naturally reflects itself in the narrative. Indeed it would not be historical were it otherwise." [1]

Now all this, I am compelled to say, appears to me a gratuitous reflection upon the Apostles, wholly unwarranted by the Gospel history. I have just shown that the words of Christ quoted by the angels to the women cannot possibly be construed into the nature of a command. To make them anything more than a prediction or a promise is

[1] *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 81.

simply to go beyond and outside the letter of Scripture. And here, to make the command of the Lord a command to the Apostles is, so far as I can understand it, no less a departure from the words of the Lord Himself. He does not say, Go, tell My Apostles ; but He does say, "Go tell my brothers". And unless it first be proved that they to whom this command was addressed were not, or could not be, literally His brothers, it is inexcusable in any writer to stigmatize with a reproach wholly undeserved those faithful followers who ought not to be accused of disobeying an order which they had never received.

In discussing our Lord's words to Mary Magdalene, I have already given my reasons for taking these words in their strictly literal sense,[1] of kinship, "My brothers," signifying My real actual brothers, the sons of My mother. But so fully persuaded am I that this is the true and only sense of the words that I cannot help reiterating my conviction, It is simply impossible that they could have been uttered by our Lord here in any other sense. Our Lord never called His Apostles by this name. In all the New Testament there is no instance of this title being applied to the disciples before His Ascension ; and after His Ascension, when it is applied to the members of the Church, it is almost always in a sense which indicates their brotherhood one with another in the Lord rather than as brethren of the Lord Himself. Therefore, to depart from the only sense in which the word can here be legitimately taken, and place in our Lord's lips a word which

[1] See above, ch. viii, p. 130 ff ; also below ch. xiv, p. 219 ff.

He neither used nor, so far as men can judge, intended to use, is a deplorable treatment of Sacred Scripture. But here it is even more, it is disastrous, inasmuch as it has robbed the Church of the best and weightiest evidence of the Resurrection of the Lord that could possibly be given.

"Go tell my brothers" is the command. "My brothers"—James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude, the four men who of all men on earth knew best the form and features, the habits and gestures, of their Divine Brother. From childhood these had been witnesses of His unblemished life, His holy walk and conversation. In manhood they were His companions in the home, in the workshop, in the street. And here, with their mother, they had attended Him to Jerusalem for His last Passover, and had witnessed, we may believe, as did others of His kindred, His last sufferings and death. Who, then, better than these could verify the Person of the Lord in His Resurrection body? who more truly witness to the identity of the Brother they had seen led up to the cross with Him whom they beheld after His triumph over the grave and gate of death? To borrow the words of Dr. Milligan: "The whole question turns upon the fact that our witnesses recognised their Lord after He rose to be the same Lord whom they had known before He died." [1]

And yet they were not disciples of the Christ. "Even his brethren did not believe on him" [2] is the attestation of the Scripture to their attitude but a

[1] W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 55.
[2] John vii. 5, R.V.

few months before His death. We can hardly believe they did not love Him, but we know that they did not believe in Him. And now comes the command: "Go tell my brothers that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."[1] We have no reason to believe that the order was not carried to them, nor any reason to doubt that they dutifully obeyed it. At any rate, we do know that He was seen of James.[2] James believed: "That which changed him from an opponent to a disciple is contained in the sentence 'then He appeared to James.'"[3] And with what result? Hardly a month had passed when, we are told by the inspired historian, these brethren, so lately unbelieving, were numbered among the disciples of the Risen Jesus in the upper room at Jerusalem actually sitting in conclave to elect an Apostle in the room of the traitor, Judas.[4] A little later James is presiding elder among Apostles and brethren assembled to decide the great question as to the liberation of the Gentiles from the yoke of the law[5]—James, "the Lord's brother", as S. Paul calls him, with Peter and John, a pillar of the Church which rested on the Resurrection of the Lord.[6] We must take one step more if we would see how far-reaching is the power of this resurrection following upon the command, "Go tell my brothers", for to it must be attributed those two noble epistles,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 10, R.V. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 7.
[3] W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 135.
[4] Acts i. 14, 15, R.V. [5] Acts xv. 13–21.
[6] Gal. i. 19; ii. 9.

that of James, the servant of the Lord, and that of Jude, the brother of James, in both of which the religion of "our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ"[1], is so richly set forth, and the hope of His Coming pressed home upon a tried and troubled Church.

If all this be not evidence the best and weightiest of the historic truth of the Resurrection, I know not what evidence is. But what becomes of it all if the utterance of the Lord, "Tell my brothers", be evaporated in the feeble, purposeless, man-made substitute, "Tell My disciples"? The majesty of the word, the magnificence of its result, are altogether wanting in the feeble generalizations in which the commentators here indulge.

Still, there is one objection which I must note before I leave the subject. It is said, "We are not told that the women delivered their message to the Lord's brothers. Mary Magdalene told hers to the Apostles, and though S. Matthew is content to leave these women proceeding on their way, yet from S. Luke we learn that they also, like Mary, carried their tidings to the Apostles." They might, indeed, do this of necessity. They might have needed the Apostles' aid to discover the brothers of the Lord in that season when Jerusalem was so overcrowded, and visitors pressed for room. It might be so, we cannot tell. But may there not be, in the unconsidered words with which S. Luke winds up his report of the return of the women, a hint that they actually did fulfil the mission entrusted to them by their Risen Master? They

[1] Jude 4, R.V.

returned, S. Luke tells us, "and told all these things to the eleven, AND TO ALL THE REST."[1] What is the meaning of these last five words? To whom must we refer them? In so exact a writer as S. Luke, it is hardly to be expected that they refer to the general body of the disciples at large; in fact, such a supposition would imply a task beyond the power of the women, the number would be too great. May they not, then, point to the little company of the Lord's mother and her sons, even already associated with the Apostles by their common sorrow, as S. Luke describes them, Acts i. 14, 15? I leave it as a conjecture which may or may not throw light on the end of the women's journey.

[1] Luke xxiv. 9, R.V.

CHAPTER XI.

THE TOMB REVISITED.

"And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not."—Luke xxiv. 24, R.V.

We are now to examine the last of the visits to the sepulchre on this first Easter morning recorded in the Gospels. It is that of the Apostle Peter, and is related only by S. Luke. Perhaps the most generally received view of this visit is that it is really the same as that related by S. John (xx. 1 ff.) as made by himself and S. Peter on receiving the intelligence brought by Mary Magdalene, and here told in a very condensed form by S. Luke.[1] This idea has at length culminated in the attempt to delete from S. Luke's Gospel the single verse which contains the account, as is shown in the marginal note of the Revised Version:—"Some ancient authorities omit ver. 12." From this it will be seen how necessary it is to examine with the most careful attention, even to the minutest particulars, the two accounts given us by the last two Evangelists.

S. Luke had given us two accounts of this fifth

[1] So Wieseler:—"We read in Luke that Peter, in consequence of what He had heard, runs to the grave, but does not see the Lord; the same fact is recorded in John, save that as an eye-witness he gives a more detailed narrative."—Karl Wieseler, *A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, p. 390.

visit : first, his own direct narrative, xxiv. 12 ; and secondly, the account related by Cleopas to the Lord, verse 24.

S. Luke's direct narrative is as follows :—"But Peter arose, and ran unto the tomb ; and stooping and looking in, he seeth the linen cloths by themselves ; and he departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass." Now before proceeding a step further, let me most earnestly entreat my readers to banish from their minds any doubt or suspicion which may have been suggested to them with regard to this verse. It is a great blot upon our Revised Translation that the Revisers have thought fit to cast doubt upon this verse 12 by the six words of their marginal note : "Some ancient authorities omit ver. 12." As a matter of fact, only the *Codex Cantabrigiensis* (D), commonly known as *Codex Bezae* (because it is a manuscript given by the Reformer Beza to the University of Cambridge), and five copies of the old Latin omit this verse. With a bad character attributed, and rightly, to this Manuscript D, notorious for its numerous lacunæ, it is little short of profanation of criticism to discredit on this authority alone this important verse, as do our Revisers, in company with a host of modern teachers. As the *Speaker's Commentary* succinctly puts it :—"It is found in ℵ A B and all other MSS and Ancient Versions. It is accepted as genuine by most editors and ought to be retained." [1]

[1] *Speaker's Comm., in loc.* Dean Burgon thus summarizes the evidence for the text :—"Nineteen uncials then, with ℵ A B at their head supported by *every known cursive copy*,—all these

Let no one think we are wasting time in thus pressing the importance of this verse as part of the Gospel of S. Luke. Delete it, and we dismiss an additional, and by no means the least important, witness to the empty tomb. In fact, it is the very importance of this visit, as first-rate evidence, that lies at the root of the whole assault that has been made against it.

Let us then proceed with S. Luke's direct history. And first, we must especially note the change, rightly made by the Revisers, of the introductory word "Then", of the Authorized Version, into "But". This was necessary in order to convey to the reader the real force of the conjunction in the original. It shows that S. Peter's reception of the news of the women who had come from the sepulchre markedly contrasted with that of others, to whom the women's words appeared "as idle talk; and they disbelieved them." However slightingly others may have regarded their report, however little they believed it, S. Peter took it in a different light; for him, there was something in it. However others looked at it, to him the whole matter seemed to demand fuller investigation; so he "arose, and ran unto the tomb."

This, I think, sufficiently answers the objection of those who reject verse 12 as interrupting the thread of the narrative. What has just been said shows clearly that, so far from interrupting, it was

vouch for the genuineness of the verse in question. The Latin,—the Syriac,—and the Egyptian versions also contain it. Eusebius,—Gregory of Nyssa,—Cyril,—Severus,—Ammonius, and others refer to it: while *no ancient writer* is found to impugn it."—*The Revision Revised*, p. 89 f.

absolutely necessary for historical accuracy to modify the assertion that the women's tidings appeared to all as "idle talk"; and so the visit of S. Peter is introduced, smoothly and naturally, to qualify the general statement.

This is S. Luke's direct narrative. Now let us see how it compares with the perfectly independent account told by Cleopas to the Lord. Verse 24 runs:—"And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not." Here, as in S. Luke's narrative, the visit—who the visitors were Cleopas did not say—followed immediately upon the hearing of the tidings of the women who had failed to find the Lord's body and had seen a vision of angels in the empty tomb. The words which tell us what they who went to the tomb found, and what they found not, indicate plainly a certain amount of faith in what they heard, no less than a strong expectation arising from it; and thus the two independent accounts, that of S. Luke and that of Cleopas, tally minutely, confirming each other.

In discussing this visit, commentators appear to have come to an agreement upon two points strangely inconsistent with one another. First, they are agreed that the "certain of them that were with us" mentioned by Cleopas in verse 24, must include Peter, mentioned by name in verse 12; and therefore, secondly, that this visit must be identified with that of Peter and John, related John xx. 1 ff. But, if Peter be one of the "certain of them that were with us" that went to the tomb, this visit

must have succeeded the return of the women who beheld the two angels who told them that Jesus was alive; and therefore it is simply impossible that the visit related by S. Luke can be the same as that told by S. John; for this latter took place before the report of any angelic vision whatever could have been made known by Mary Magdalene, she having run back from the sepulchre to the two Apostles before the angel was perceived. Neither could Peter and John on their way to the tomb have had any report from the other Mary and her companions, for these had all departed from the sepulchre before the arrival of these Apostles, who could not have met them on the way as these women, we are told by S. Mark, when they departed from the sepulchre, "said nothing to any man". From all this, we are plainly forced to the conclusion that the visit of Peter and John recorded by the latter (xx. 1 ff.) is a different, because an earlier, event from that of S. Peter as related by S. Luke.

But, besides this almost self-evident fact, S. Luke's account of S. Peter's visit, so far from being an epitome of S. John's narrative, differs in so many points as to make it a totally distinct event.

Let us compare the several particulars of the two narratives. If we except the stooping down, they have nothing in common.

(*a*) Peter and John start together for the tomb. In S. Luke (verse 12), Peter only is mentioned.

(*b*) Peter and John went forth and went toward the tomb, and they ran (ἔτρεχον, *etrechon, imperfect*) both together. In S. Luke, Peter arose and ran (ἔδραμεν, *edramen, aorist*).

(*c*) John it was who, arriving before Peter, stooped down without at first entering in; but Peter enters in. In S. Luke's narrative, Peter stoops down, looks in, but no mention is made of his entering.

(*d*) In S. John's account, the two disciples enter into the tomb separately, each making a separate inspection. S. Luke speaks of S. Peter as satisfying himself by what he saw (βλέπει, *blepei*) from his position in the doorway.

(*e*) S. John states the result. The other disciple "saw and believed", and the two departed together. S. Luke declares of Peter that he departed to his home, "wondering at that which was come to pass."

With such a comparison before us, have we the smallest ground for imagining that S. Luke has here recorded a distorted and misplaced narrative of the visit of the two Apostles related by S. John? The very supposition deprives us of another undesigned coincidence which, far from discrediting the narrative, entirely establishes its truth. It is this: At the first visit, S. John relates that S. Peter beheld (θεωρεῖ, *theōrei*) "the linen cloths lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but rolled up in a place by itself."[1] Now S. Luke, recounting S. Peter's second visit to the tomb, by the use of one word (μόνα, *mona*, *by themselves*) shows us that the condition of the tomb had remained unchanged in the interval:—"He seeth the linen cloths by themselves" (μόνα, *mona*),[2] that is, the cloths were lying separate from the napkin, which lay in a place by itself. Nor is

[1] John xx. 6, 7 R.V. [2] Luke xxiv. 12, R.V.

this all. What S. John declares that he, S. Peter, saw by close inspection (θεωρεῖ, *theōrei*), S. Luke declares that he beheld at the first glance (βλέπει, *blepei*), as he looked in at the door. Having at his first visit made a thorough examination of the tomb and its contents, at the second, a glance sufficed to show him that all remained as it had been.

This comparison, therefore, of the several details of the two narratives results in the conclusion that S. Luke's, so far from being an epitome of S. John's account, is by reason of its many differences, notwithstanding its brevity, a distinct record of an entirely different visit.

The prominence of S. Peter in the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection morning is too significant to be passed over without a word. First, Mary Magdalene brings her tidings from the tomb to Peter and John. They run thither and examine for themselves, and return home. But, before their arrival at the sepulchre, an angel had charged Mary the mother of James, Salome, and Joanna (probably), "Go, tell his disciples *and Peter*, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you."[1] When and where Peter had received this message, we cannot tell; apparently, not before his return with John to "their own home";[2] possibly, before the arrival of Mary Magdalene and the other women with their accounts of a vision of angels and the appearances of the Lord to them severally. Was this message, then, the first touch of the loving Saviour to heal the broken and contrite heart of the repentant Apostle,

[1] Mark xvi. 7, R.V. [2] John xx. 10.

and at the same time to deepen that repentance by awakening a memory of that last journey over the Mount of Olives? It may be. Who can tell? Then comes the wondrous story of the "other women". They told of a vision of angels, and more —they had seen and held the Lord Himself. How natural, that on the ears of one at least their words by no means fell as "idle talk". The visit with John, the mysterious spectacle of the clothes within the tomb, and then perhaps the angelic message delivered by Mary and her companion, or companions, had roused within the heart of Peter, it may be, memories of the Transfiguration and of the dormant but now quickening words spoken in Galilee and upon Olivet, the latter immediately followed by S. Peter's self-confident vaunt: "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I". (Mark xiv. 29.) Perhaps he, too, may see the Lord. Again he turns his steps to the sepulchre, again he stoops down and peers in through the low entrance to the tomb; for a second time he sees the linen cloths "by themselves", away from the napkin where it had swathed the sacred head. It was all inexplicable. He "departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass."

Once more, Cleopas, a few hours later, tells that Risen Master that He had not been beheld by any one. And when that Master had revealed Himself and vanished, and Cleopas and the brother disciple return to the Holy City, it is to meet the joyous greeting: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." [1]

[1] Luke xxiv. 34.

CHAPTER XII.

RISEN INDEED.

"Now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep."—1 Cor. xv. 20, R.V.

HERE, then, we close our examination of the occurrences that filled the forenoon of the Resurrection morning. And here, once more, it may be convenient to recapitulate the order of these several events.

1. Three, or perhaps four, women; Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and, it may be, Joanna; set out from their homes in the Holy City just before dawn to visit the sepulchre. Arriving near the tomb they beheld the stone rolled away.

2. At sight of this, Mary Magdalene, leaving her companions, betakes herself to the homes of Peter and John, whom she informs of the removal of the Lord's body.

3. Upon the departure of Mary Magdalene, her companions (two, or three), having entered the tomb, beheld an angel sitting on the right side, who tells them the Lord is risen, and invites them to see where the body had been laid. He further charges them with a message to the disciples and

Peter: "He goeth before you into Galilee." Upon which the women departed with fear and great joy, and ran to bring His disciples word.

4. The two Apostles, Peter and John, arrived at the tomb. Making an inspection of its contents, the appearance of the grave-clothes lying flat, and the napkin "twirled round" where it had encased the head, on the ledge, "apart", John is convinced of the Resurrection, "He saw and believed"; and the two disciples depart home.

5. Mary Magdalene follows after the two Apostles, who appear to have left the sepulchre before her arrival. Weeping, she looks in and sees two angels sitting, one at the head and the other at the foot, where the body of Jesus had lain. Answering the angel's question, she turns and beholds Jesus standing. She fails to recognize Him until He addresses her by name. Forbidden by Christ to touch Him, she receives a message from Him: "Go unto *my brothers*, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." She thereupon departs to the disciples whom she tells, "I have seen the Lord".

6. Another company of women (distinguished by S. Luke from those already mentioned by the fact that they had purchased the spices on the Friday evening, while the other—according to S. Mark, Mary and her companions—purchased their spices on the Saturday evening) now arrive at the tomb. They find the stone rolled away, and, entering and not finding the body which they sought, stand perplexed. To their consternation two angels appear and address them: "Why seek ye the

living among the dead? . . . Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee."

7. Returning from the tomb, Jesus Himself appears to these women, who, unrebuked, clasp His feet: this is related only by S. Matthew. To these also He gives a charge, similar to that already given to Mary Magdalene: "Go tell *my brothers* that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." All these things they tell "to the eleven, and to all the rest." But the women's words "appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them."

8. Peter, however, with some others hastened to the tomb. He finds the interior in the same condition as he and John had beheld it earlier in the morning, but sees neither angels nor Jesus, whereupon he returns to his home, "wondering at that which was come to pass."

In these eight particulars, then, we have comprised the history of five visits made to the sepulchre on the morning of the Resurrection Day. These visits were made by different persons or groups of persons, at different times, and under different circumstances. Eight, or possibly nine, if not more, individuals were engaged in these visits, all of whom tell their own tale. Their narratives are conveyed to us in the four Gospels; in one instance by the Apostle John, himself an actor in the scene he describes; sometimes by those who received the accounts directly from the actors themselves. For the story of Mary the mother of James and her companions, Salome and Joanna, was told by them directly to S. Matthew, as one of the Apostles to

whom they came. The same story was in all likelihood told by the same women to S. Mark, an early disciple of the Lord, a son of Mary, another disciple, who appears to have kept open house for the first Christians at Jerusalem, whose son, therefore, had the amplest opportunities for obtaining exact knowledge from these women of everything that had occurred. S. Peter, too, who was another of the persons engaged in this morning's transactions, is admitted by all scholars to have borne no little part as a guide and instructor of S. Mark in writing his Gospel[1]—an additional and important factor in weighing these histories of the empty tomb. The visit of Mary Magdalene was related to S. John and the other Apostles by Mary herself, while the bond of a common affection for the Beloved Master naturally suggests the fullest communication by her to the Evangelist of all that had happened. Who and how many the other women were, we are not told ; but what befell them was told by them likewise " to the eleven and to all the rest." Their history is furnished to us by S. Luke, the most exact of historians, who himself tells us " traced the course of all things accurately from the first ", implying also that his information came from those who were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." Assuming that he had prepared and published his Gospel within twenty-five years of the Lord's death and Resurrection, there would be ample time for him to have conversed with many who had lived in Jerusalem when these events

[1] " In Mark we have the Petrine tradition completed into a Gospel."—Salmon, *Introd. to the N.T.*, (ninth ed.) p. 142.

occurred, possibly with some of these very visitors to the empty tomb. Thus, for full knowledge and accurate statement the history of S. Luke can be placed side by side with those of the three other Evangelists.

What then strikes us most in this fourfold history of the sayings and doings of these eight or more persons who all testified to the emptiness of the tomb on the Resurrection morning? That it is little less than a miracle that four independent histories; describing what these eight or more persons saw, and heard, and did, on five different occasions; could have been written without one single inconsistency or contradiction discoverable in any one of the four. And yet this, as has been shown in the preceding pages, is the absolute fact. Spite of the severest scrutiny of critics, often supported by the unwarranted concessions of friends, the candid and patient investigator is compelled to admit that not one of the four Evangelists has made the smallest trip in his narrative of the empty tomb.

Again, it is no less than a miracle that there should be so little of the miracle in the story of the greatest miracle that the earth has ever witnessed. That the superhuman and supernatural element is present in such a history is simply a necessity. An angel rolls away the mighty stone, another presents himself to Mary and Salome, two more address Mary Magdalene, and two others (if not the same two) address the other women, who approach the tomb upon her departure from it; and, greatest of all, to Mary and to these other women the Lord manifests Himself successively in the glory of His

bodily Resurrection. But how is all this told? Not with the fabulous and ridiculous exaggerations that debase this glorious event in the pages of subsequent uncanonical writers, with whom history is lost in fable or myth. How comes it that none of this is found in any line of the Gospel narrative? How comes it that lowly peasant men and women, untrained, perhaps with one exception, in the art of writing, tell their wondrous tale with such artless simplicity and yet with a sublime majesty that commands the admiration of all the ages? Again I say, This is nothing short of a miracle.

And, once more, Who can account for that miraculous instinct which has led each of the four writers to seize upon and relate those incidents only to which they themselves can bear witness, or, as in the case of S. Luke, give on first-hand testimony? S. Mark passes by in silence the earthquake, the angel that rolled away the stone, the guard that swooned at terror of His presence; it is S. Matthew, whose office might lead us to expect an acquaintance with Roman officials, who, alone of the four, records that which had been seen only by Roman soldiers. In the narrative of the first visit to the tomb, common to the first two Evangelists and all but substantially the same in both, it is S. Mark and not S. Matthew who betrays the presence and leading of his Apostolic guide and inserts the name Peter in the angelic message. While S. Luke describes the visit of other women to the tomb as he learned it years afterwards, possibly from some one or more of the actors in the event; it is S. Matthew, who with his own ears heard their history, who

preserves their narrative of the meeting of the Lord by the way. S. John; writing years after, probably when all who had taken part in the stirring events of this morning had fallen asleep in Jesus; relates that only which had burned itself indelibly into his memory, his own visit to the tomb along with his brother Apostle, Peter, where the stretched-out grave-clothes and the separated napkin had wrought conviction in his soul; following this up with the well-remembered story of Mary Magdalene, told to the Apostles, the first tidings of the Risen Jesus and the first message to the brothers of His own house. How is it, if not by miracle, that witnesses, without collusion or constraint, have, each one for himself, kept to that which each alone had seen and could testify for himself?

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BODY OF HIS GLORY.

"It is raised a spiritual body."—1 Cor. xv. 44.

In the foregoing pages I have purposely omitted all reference to the much-vexed question as to the nature of the body with which the Lord rose from the tomb; partly because it did not seem to come within the scope of this volume, but much more, as transcending the limits of human comprehension, at least in this life. And yet I cannot close without venturing a word or two upon the subject.

What, then, is the body of the Lord's glory?—glory acquired, not at the Ascension, as so many imagine, but from the very moment that He rose from the tomb. "Christ" as Steinmeyer writes "from the moment of His passing from the grave, was clothed with the body in which He ascended to heaven and sat at the right hand of God."[1] Far more in harmony with Scripture are these words, it seems to me, than the opinion expressed by Dr. Swete when, speaking of Christ's appearance by the Sea of Galilee, he writes:—"Some kind of change perhaps had passed over the features; the beginning of the final change which transforms the natural body into the spiritual."[2]

[1] *The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 296 f.
[2] *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, p. 59.

In discussing this question, let it be clearly understood that I confine myself to the Resurrection of the Lord Himself, apart from any consideration of the resurrection, whether it be of the just or unjust, at the close of this dispensation. For there are two facts which, I think, preclude us from instituting an exact comparison between the Resurrection of our Lord and that future resurrection, whether of Christians or of mankind in general. The one fact is that the interval, of barely thirty-six hours, between the entombment and the Resurrection of the Lord, does away with any question as to the possibility of an analogy between the resurrection of those bodies which may have for hundreds or thousands of years utterly disappeared in the dust with which they had mingled, and the Resurrection of the body of Christ. Whatever conclusion we may form as to the nature of the body with which the Lord rose, it affords us no ground for judging as to the resurrection bodies of these.

The second fact, which makes the Resurrection of our Lord unique, is this, That the body which He laid down at death was the body of Him in whom was no sin. Wearied He often was in His life on earth, He hungered, He thirsted, He was subject to pain inflicted from without; but none of this interfered with the great fact of the sinlessness of Jesus. I do not call attention to this fact with the desire to propound any theory: I notice it merely as a fact which must be taken into account in any comparison between the resurrection body of Christ and those of all mankind. I here concern myself with the Resurrection of the Lord's body only.

A first comparison of the inspired narratives of the appearances of the Risen Lord undoubtedly impresses us with the idea that in His personality and identity His body was, and yet was not, the same after His Resurrection as that with which His disciples were familiar before His death. To borrow the words of Bishop Westcott: "This Body which was recognised as essentially the same Body, had yet undergone some marvellous change." [1]

Though Mary Magdalene at first supposed Him to be the gardener, she recognized the voice as of Him who had so often spoken to her in life, and quickly attested her recognition by her reverent and joyful exclamation, "Rabboni", my Master. In a little while other women, met by the Risen Lord and greeted with His "All Hail", "came and took hold of his feet." Some hours later, the two disciples who had invited their unrecognized fellow-traveller to abide at their lodging, beheld Him sit down at their table, when, as "He took the bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them", "their eyes were opened, and they knew him." And then, as soon as might be, on that first Sunday night in the world's history, these same disciples had hurried back to the Apostles at Jerusalem. The doors were shut. While engaged in eager conversation on the wondrous events of that day, suddenly Jesus appeared in the midst of them. They were terrified and affrighted, supposing they beheld a spirit. Jesus speedily calmed their fears with the significant words: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see:

[1] *The Gospel of the Resurrection* (fourth ed.), ch. ii, § 20, p. 162.

for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet." [1] And still further to dispel their doubts, He asks for and eats before them "a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb." [2] Eight days afterwards, the Lord again manifested Himself in the same assembly, and addressing Himself to Thomas, who would not be persuaded by his fellow Apostles of their Master's appearing, replies, taking up the Apostle's own incredulous words: "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side." [3]

From all these instances which I have grouped together, the impression gathered is undoubtedly this, That the Lord's body, as He appeared after His Resurrection, was in every respect such as His disciples knew it to be before His death. He sat down with them, He suffered them to handle Him, He showed them His hands and His feet and His side, and bid them observe His flesh and His bones as distinguishing Him from a spirit such as they dreaded. But notwithstanding all this, there is a subtile difference apparent in every narrative, convincing us that, though the same Jesus, His was not the body such as they had known it heretofore.

[1] Luke xxiv. 39, 40, R.V. Also His side, according to S. John xx. 20. The critics here would make S. Luke, because he omits "His side", contradict S. John; and S. John, because he omits "His feet", contradict S. Luke. Yet how natural that the Apostle who had witnessed and recorded the piercing of the Lord's side, and is about to narrate the Lord's words to Thomas, should make mention of the side, omitting the feet, of the Lord.

[2] Some MSS. omit "Of an honeycomb."

[3] John xx. 27, R.V.

We are not told of any dwelling-place where He made His home in those forty days between His Resurrection and Ascension. There is not an appearance to the disciples related but what was sudden and unexpected, and His departure was equally mysterious. One moment the disciples beheld Him seated before them breaking and handing them the bread which they ate; they looked again, and He was gone. But even more miraculous was another appearance. It was in a room where the disciples were assembled and the doors were shut for fear of the Jews that He suddenly stood in their midst. What man possessed of flesh and bones was ever before or since known thus to accomplish the impossible? [1]

A comparison, then, of the manifestations of the Risen Lord recorded in the Gospels reveals to us His risen body as partaking of a twofold nature, that of man and that of spirit. On the one hand, Jesus walked, and sat, and spoke. He was seen and heard of His disciples, and by their hands was handled. To them he declared: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." But on the other hand, this same Jesus, in their lodging at Emmaus, when he blessed the bread and brake and gave it to the two disciples, vanished from their

[1] Dr. Vogan (*The True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, App. S., p. 557) strongly dissents from this view:—"The assertion, then," he writes "that our Lord passed through the substance of the closed doors has no sufficient warrant, and is much too confident." But that the fact asserted by the Evangelist is that the Lord did so pass through the closed doors is, notwithstanding, the view now held by most scholars.

sight.[1] A little later on the same night, when these two disciples joined the Eleven in their room at Jerusalem, where "the doors were shut where the disciples were for fear of the Jews", Jesus stood in the midst of them. Is it possible to go beyond these two facts? Have we, in this our finite condition, faculties to comprehend the nature or constitution of this wondrous body, the type and firstfruits of that which the Apostle calls a spiritual body?[2] By which spiritual body, the Apostle does not oppose an immaterial to a material body, but rather contrasts the psychical body (or natural, as the Authorized Version has it) with the spiritual body; the body of this life moved by the desires, the affections, the passions, contrasted with that body of the hereafter wholly penetrated by the spirit, the body of Christ's glory. The idea is adequately expressed by Bishop Gore:—"The risen body of Christ was spiritual" he writes "not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and finally subjugated to spirit, and not to the exigencies of physical life. Matter no longer restricted Him or hindered. It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose."[3] This is Holy Scripture, neither more nor less, and beyond this I dare not venture to travel.

Attempts have been made over and over again

[1] As Steinmeyer comments:—"The undoubtedly correct translation of the Vulgate: 'evanuit ex oculis eorum.' The object of His appearing was reached; the appearing itself took end; the Risen One returned to His invisibility."—*The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 308.

[2] σῶμα πνευματικόν (*sōma pneumatikon*) 1 Cor. xv. 44.

[3] *The Body of Christ*, p. 127.

to define the nature of this body of the Lord to which His disciples are to be conformed at His Coming, but all seem to err on one side or the other. There are those, for instance, who press the Lord's words "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have" so rigorously as to eliminate altogether the spirit from the spiritual body. Thus Dr. Vogan maintains the impossibility of the body of the Risen Lord penetrating the shut door when entering or leaving the room where the disciples were; he supposes, if I do not mistake him, either that the Lord entered or left when the door was open, unperceived by the disciples; or else, wrought a miracle in order to effect his entrance or egress. Is not this, however, to destroy all conception of the spiritual body, if not to reduce it to the level of that body with which we are familiar?

Again, there are others who on their side do away with the reality of this body. Because a spirit is immaterial, they hold it impossible that the spiritual body can be in any sense material. Hostile critics of course question the history of the Resurrection day, asserting that the narratives of the Evangelists are merely the stories of incompetent witnesses too startled and affrighted to describe the truth of what they saw; or else that they are legends, traditional growths incorporated in after years into the Gospels, aud so these critics reject the fact of a substantial body altogether.

But there are others, neither unbelieving nor antagonistic to the truth and authority of Holy Scripture, who are yet opposed to the reality of the material side in the spiritual body of the Lord.

They do not indeed question His bodily appearance to the women at the sepulchre or to the disciples at Emmaus. They fully admit that He presented His body to be handled by the disciples in the room where they were assembled, and in their presence partook of the broiled fish and of the honeycomb which at His request they gave to Him. But this bodily manifestation, they hold, though real, to be only temporary. They assert, what is indeed true, that such a material manifestation was absolutely necessary ; in fact, the only way possible by which men in the flesh, such as we are, could be convinced of the reality of the Resurrection. Therefore they hold that for this purpose the Lord, in condescension to His disciples' need, assumed a bodily form which, when become unnecessary, He discarded.

But, here again, is not the Scripture set at variance ? Though a spiritual body, where are we told that this body is immaterial, or that its material constituent will ever cease to be ? The Risen Lord led forth in Person His disciples from the Holy City to the Mount of Olives, giving to them by word of mouth His final instructions and commandments. Arrived over against Bethany, " He lifted up his hands, and blessed them " ; " He parted from them, and was carried up into heaven." [1] Here we have the brief but significant history of the final departure of the Risen Lord from earth, but in this He bears His body with Him. His hands are lifted up, His voice is heard uttering words of blessing, and to the Eleven, as they gaze in wonder, there appear two men in white apparel to dismiss

[1] Luke xxiv. 51, R.V.

them with these words: "This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." [1] This Jesus who for forty days had been appearing unto them, this Jesus whom they had seen and heard and their hands handled, the Eleven are taught shall so come again to earth as they had just now "beheld him going into heaven."

Now surely, in this description of the departure from earth of the Risen Lord Who had for forty days been manifesting Himself in bodily shape to His disciples, we must understand something different from the appearing and disappearing of the same Lord in His pre-incarnate state. Let us compare the appearances of the angel of the Lord—that is of Christ (Jehovah) as we must understand it—to Gideon[2], and also to Manoah.[3] In both these instances the Lord (Jehovah) appears in human form. In both, His coming and going are mysterious. His departure, in the case of Manoah, supernatural. And yet, notwithstanding that He appears as a man, as having a rod in His hand, we know that it is the manifestation of a spirit only and not of a human being. Of the same Lord, the converse of His words to the disciples must, in these Old Testament appearances, be true: I am a spirit, I have not flesh and bones as men have. Therefore I take it that it is not unreasonable to conclude that the spiritual body of the Risen Lord, the body with which He ascended into Heaven and in which He manifested

[1] Acts i. 11, R.V. [2] Judges vi. 14, 21, 22.
[3] Judges xiii. 15–23.

Himself for forty days to His disciples on earth, was something truly and really different from that in which, as a spirit, He appeared in Old Testament times; and that the difference consisted in the flesh and bones of which He declared Himself possessed.

So far, we have travelled along the sure, if narrow road of Scripture, nothing importing, nothing expunging. And there is one step more that we may venture to take on the same path; this, That the spiritual body, on which we have been dwelling, is, and can be, none other than that reverently laid [1] in the tomb by Joseph and Nicodemus, the same body albeit a changed body. As Scripture leaves us in no doubt as to where, and by whom, it was entombed, neither does the same Scripture admit a shadow of doubt as to what was laid within the tomb. From the cross to the grave the Gospels never for one moment lose sight of that sacred body marked by the prints of the nails and the thrust of the spear. It is laid within grave-clothes described in full detail, in which it is borne to a tomb carefully distinguished from every other, and jealously watched from the Friday evening till the Sunday morning when it vanished from its place. Witness after witness is called up to prove the emptiness of the grave, evidence that cannot be gainsaid laid before us to show that, though its cerements lay undisturbed, the body which they

[1] "This Body which was recognised as essentially the same Body, had yet undergone some marvellous change."—B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection* (fourth ed.), ch. ii., § 20, p. 162.

enwrapped was nowhere to be found. The Roman guard, the two Apostles, two companies of women, Mary Magdalene, and S. Peter for the second time—that is to say, twelve distinct persons, if not more, on six different occasions, unite in their testimony that the tomb was empty from early dawn on the Sunday morning. In vain is the appeal made to Roman soldiers, to priests and elders and Sadducees, to produce the body laid there on Friday evening and so jealously guarded throughout the hours of Saturday. The foolish fable, "The disciples came by night and stole him away", at no time received any credence; history, sacred or profane, records no protest against the Resurrection on the ground that the body had been taken away.

But what history does record is this, That no less than fifteen persons, on five different occasions, between early dawn on Sunday and the night of the same day, had beheld and recognized, had heard and felt, this same Jesus who was sought for in vain within the tomb; nay, more, had been permitted by Him to identify His body by the prints of the nails in the hands and feet and by the spear-wound in His side. It was verily and indeed the same body, and yet, assuredly, not such as they had known it before His death.

There was a certain degree of mystery in the several appearances; in two of them it was something more. The instantaneous vanishing at Emmaus, the penetration through the fast-closed doors at Jerusalem, these are phenomena disclosing the twofold character manifested by the body of the Risen Lord on the day of His Resurrection; and

such, without contradiction, it continued to be until in the same body Jesus was "taken up" [1] into heaven. "He led them out until they were over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up unto heaven." [2]

Scanty as are the notices of the Lord's final ascension—S. Luke alone particularizing; and, of the other three, S. Mark alone mentioning it—we have, from the terms employed, the strongest grounds for concluding that the body of the Risen Lord underwent no change between His egress from the tomb and His final departure from the earth. There is the *lifting up of the hands*, the same which He displayed to His disciples on the night of His Resurrection, bearing the print of the nails which pierced Him on the cross. And more remarkable still is the significance of the words employed in the three several passages to designate the ascent. He "was received up", so S. Mark.[3] He "was

[1] Acts i. 9: ἐπήρθη (*epērthē*). It is added, verse 10, R.V.: "He went", πορευομένου αὐτοῦ (*poreuomenou autou*). Mark xvi. 19: "was received up", ἀνελήφθη (*anelēphthē*). Luke xxiv. 51, R.V.: "was carried up", ἀνεφέρετο (*anephereto*).

[2] Luke xxiv. 50, 51, R.V.

[3] I need hardly say I adhere to the verdict of Dean Burgon, whose vindication of the last twelve verses of S. Mark's Gospel is as unanswered as it is unanswerable:—Their "genuineness must needs be reckoned among the things that are absolutely certain." (*The Last Twelve Verses of S. Mark*, Dedication, p. vi.) The recent discovery of the Freer MS. of the Gospels, where these last twelve verses are to be found (though with an interpolation) may perhaps somewhat shake the confidence of those critics who scorn the conclusion of this learned and diligent scholar.

carried up", as it is in the Gospel of S. Luke. While, in the Acts of the Apostles, the same Evangelist declares that "He was taken up". These three words, though quite distinct, yet convey the same idea, that of something taken, carried, lifted—words, though quite true of a "spiritual BODY", altogether foreign to the idea of a pure spirit. Add to this, the strong idea of personal activity conveyed in the expression "while they were looking stedfastly into heaven AS HE WENT", followed by the angels' words: "This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." A disappearance like this cannot but be held to be impossible for the natural body of any human being.

This, then, is the revelation afforded us by the Gospels of the nature of the body of the Risen Lord. But, to this it is objected that it is positively contradicted by the statement of S. Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, concerning the resurrection of the saints. There he insists that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"[1], whereas the Lord says of His own risen body: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having."[2]

Now a very little consideration will suffice to show that so far from contradicting the words of the Lord, the words of the Apostle singularly confirm them. We have just to ask ourselves whether the words of the Lord, "flesh and bones", and those of the Apostle, "flesh and blood", bear the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 50. [2] Luke xxiv. 39, R.V.

same meaning; or rather, were they used by the Lord and His Apostle in precisely the same sense? If we can show that they were used by each in a different sense, then there can be no contradiction.

Now, that the Lord intended to point to His flesh and bones, which the Apostles might see and touch, as constituent parts of His body, is beyond doubt. The Apostles were to see, and touch, and thereby know that He was not a spirit.

But what does the Apostle intend by his expression "flesh and blood"? Most commonly indeed the phrase is understood in the same sense as that in which the Lord uses the phrase "flesh and bones". But this is by no means the sense which it is found to bear in the New Testament writings. "Flesh and blood" in the New Testament is simply, to borrow Bishop Ellicott's words, "a Hebrew circumlocution for man." [1]

The reader will do well to note the constant signification in other places where the phrase is found. Thus, the Lord says to S. Peter, upon the latter's glorious confession of the Divinity of Christ: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." [2] That is to say, it was a Divine revelation and not a truth imparted through human agency. Again, when S. Paul tells us that after his conversion he "conferred not with flesh and blood", but "went away into Arabia" [3], he only expresses in Jewish fashion the fact that he took no counsel with any man. Once more, the same Apostle, writing of the Chris-

[1] *Comm.*, Gal. i. 16.
[2] Matt. xvi. 17.
[3] Gal. i. 16, 17, R.V.

tian conflict, adopts the same phrase when he declares that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood"[1], plainly meaning that the foe is not human but angelic. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has a passage in which the phrase is used in precisely the same sense. Speaking of the necessity of our Lord's Incarnation, he writes: "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same."[2]

All these passages, then, serve as a key to S. Paul's use of the phrase in his letter to the Corinthians. There he simply asserts that man in his fallen sinful state, subject, as he is, to decay and corruption, cannot inherit the kingdom of God. To do this, the Apostle argues, he must experience a change of nature, which change is to be effected at the Parousia of Christ: "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."[3] It may be necessary to point out that the resurrection and change here spoken of apply to believers only, only to them "that are Christ's, at his coming."[4]

From all this, then, it appears that the Apostle's argument is, not that flesh and blood (or still less may we say, bones), are inadmissible into the kingdom of God; but that it is man in his corrupt and fallen nature who is excluded.[5] It follows also

[1] Eph. vi. 12, R.V. [2] Heb. ii. 14, R.V.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 52, R.V. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 23.

[5] If Canon Evans is right (*The Speaker's Commentary*, on 1 Cor. xv. 50), that we should "read δύνανται [*dunatai*], not δύνανται [*dunantai*]", that is, *is able* not *are able*, "for clearly *flesh and blood* represents one twofold idea, and therefore requires a

from his argument that whatever is raised or changed at the Parousia must of necessity become incorruptible as well as immortal: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." [1] They who shall participate in the blessedness of the Parousia are thereby attested as to their Divine sonship: 'Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection." [2] Therefore, that the Risen Jesus declared Himself possessed of flesh and bones is not merely uncontradicted, but is strongly confirmed by S. Paul, since he asserts of the resurrection body that it is raised in incorruption. It only demonstrates that the flesh and bones which the Lord submitted to the sight and touch of His disciples, though actually and literally what Christ pronounced them to be, were changed and not of that nature which they possessed when borne from the cross to the grave. It were profanation to speak of them otherwise.

Here let me return for a moment to the question, Is the body presented to us by the Evangelists the permanent characteristic of the Risen Lord, such as He bore with Him into heaven and such as He would present again at His return to earth, supposing He revisited it? The tendency of modern Church divines is to answer this question in the

verb singular", the above explanation is forcibly confirmed. Bishop Ellicott, agreeing with this reading, writes:—"So Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, on external authority which, with the internal probability of a grammatical correction apparently preponderates."—*S. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians in loc.* [1] 1 Cor. xv. 53. [2] Luke xx. 36, R.V.

negative. Thus Dr. Sparrow Simpson rejects what he calls " The gross materialism of the Latin School, and the unhappy exegesis which explained away S. Paul's ' flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,' thereby forcing it into unnatural harmony with the words of Christ, ' flesh and bones as ye see me have ' ; the latter being mistakenly supposed to describe the spiritual body's normal state " [1] ; and further, gives his own idea of the Gospel appearances in the following words :—" This glorified human body, habitually dwelling in non-terrestrial conditions, temporarily reassumes the human outline, and solid frame, and former appearance, and marks of the wounds, for evidential and instructive purposes." [2] And in another passage this writer quotes Bishop Westcott to the same effect :—" A little reflection will show that the special outward forms in which the Lord was pleased to make Himself sensibly recognisable by His disciples were no more necessarily connected with His glorified Person than the robe He wore." [3]

But while seeking to explain away the materialism of those who accept literally the statements of the Evangelists, does not this theory itself rest upon a very shadowy foundation ? In plain language, is it not tantamount to saying that the body of the Risen Lord, which was beheld by His disciples during the forty days succeeding His Resurrection, ceased on the fortieth day to be His body any longer ? And, worse still, does it not open the way

[1] *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*, p. 420.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 418.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 417.

to the unbeliever to affirm that the body which we are told was seen and handled by the disciples was no real body at all, and that consequently no resurrection could have taken place? Thus the attempt to simplify and make more acceptable the facts furnished by the Evangelists, is seen to be in greater need of explanation than that which it endeavours to explain.

But are the Latin Fathers, who are credited with the literal acceptance of Christ's appearances in the Gospels, and who for so doing are charged with a gross materializing, as culpable as the modern school would have us believe? They simply take the Evangelists' records as they stand though no explanation occurs to them as possible. And how could it be? The phenomenon before them was the same as it still continues to be, unique in the history of the world. Mankind has never had, and never will have until the return of the Risen Lord, any such experience as that vouchsafed to the disciples during the forty days of the Lord's appearing to them. What they learned of the conditions and capabilities of that risen body, we cannot tell, nor how far the Lord might have been pleased to reveal these. All that we have for our guidance are the few and occasional experiences so faithfully recorded under Divine command for the instruction of mankind until the coming again of the Risen and Ascended Lord. But what, we may reverently ask, can we know from these limited records of the nature, powers, capabilities, of that glorious body which was then, as for a moment, revealed? Absolutely nothing beyond what the words of Scripture tell us.

But suppose more had been revealed, discovering more and greater mysteries than the narratives that record the appearances of this risen body already possess for us, is it for us to assert that such a body is impossible, contrary to the laws of Nature or matter? Has even the modern mind attained such a knowledge of these laws that it can venture to assert that the mind of man can proceed no further? Can any one venture to predict that only what is possible for us now will be possible for the generations of a hundred years hence? May not the impossibilities of to-day become then the commonplaces of the world? Science, therefore, I hold, has no reason to proffer objections to the risen body of the Gospels until that time comes when it can proclaim that the page of its discovery is closed.[1]

There is also, I think, something to be said against this limitation theory of the risen body on the ground of Scripture itself. It contradicts the tenor of the Divine revelation. In the whole Scripture there is not the slightest hint given of the laying aside of this "spiritual body"[2]—for

[1] This point of view seems to be conceded in the volume *Foundations*, recently issued by seven Oxford scholars, in which the *credenda*, or perhaps I should say the *non credenda*, of Christianity are discussed. In the paper *The Historic Christ* (pp. 135–6) Mr. Streeter writes:—"To shut up the range of possible explanation within the limits of our experien e of things material is virtually to deny the existence of the spiritual altogether."

[2] "We cannot at all speak of a putting on and a putting off; and still less of a twofold body, a material and an immaterial. The body of the risen Lord is one. As to its essence it is a *spiritual body*,—the organ of that life to which the Risen One is called."—F. L. Steinmeyer, *The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 307.

so I must call that body in which the Risen Lord manifested Himself—before, at, or after, His final departure from earth. More than this, even the Old Testament Scriptures foreshadow the appearing of the Son of Man in human form—when Daniel speaks of "One like unto a son of man" coming unto the Ancient of Days, whom they brought near before Him, and to whom was given everlasting dominion,[1] when Zechariah tells us of "The Lord" who shall go forth to battle against the Gentiles in the last tribulation of Israel, and that "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives"[2], and when again the same prophet declares of his nation, "They shall look unto me whom they have pierced"[3], it is hard to think otherwise than of the appearing of the Second Person of the Trinity hereafter in human form. Then again, as before pointed out, this Risen Lord in His celestial, not terrestrial, abode is regarded by S. Paul as endowed with a body; spiritual as contrasted with the natural or psychical, but still, a body,[4] thereby differentiating the Lord from the angels.

So then we come back to the point whence we started and profess our content with the Divine revelation, without any endeavour to make clearer what is as yet beyond the comprehension of human intelligence, and though "It is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is."[5]

[1] Dan. vii. 13, 14, R.V.
[2] Zech. xiv. 3, 4
[3] Zech. xii. 10, R.V.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 44.
[5] 1 John iii. 2, R.V.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT.

"The opening of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple."—Psalm cxix. 130, R.V.

WHAT lessons are we to take home from this study of the Resurrection narratives?

1. The first must be emphatically this, That in the history of this Easter morning no error or contradiction whatever, arising from the haste, the confusion, the misunderstanding, or what you will, of the Evangelists or their informants, can be proved against any one of them. Our study of the Gospels establishes clearly the fact that all these supposed errors, so freely alleged by modern critics, must be charged, not to the sacred histories, but to the neglect or perversion of the words of the inspired Writers, as neatly expressed by Professor Orr :—"It is the imagination of the critics, not that of the Evangelist, that is active."[1] For example, when we are told that the one angel of Matthew and Mark is contradicted by the two angels of Luke, as Dr. Swete implies in the following words :—"Afterwards when they came to tell their tale, impressions were found to differ; one thought she saw a white-robed youth sitting on the right of the

[1] *The Resurrection of Jesus*, p. 188.

entrance ; another reported that two men in dazzling attire appeared to them." [1] Reading this, who can stifle the question, What foundation does Scripture afford for such a series of statements, unless indeed it be, as I have shown to be the case [2], that expositors will insist on identifying two narratives which the Scriptures themselves distinguish by every possible mark of differentiation ? it is the expositors who identify the two, and not the Evangelists, who are the men to be convicted of ignorance and mistake.

Again, I would ask, What ground has any teacher of the Christian religion for such a statement as this :—" The first surprises of the Resurrection Day fell to the share of witnesses who were little qualified to retain or to communicate to others an exact and connected account of what they saw and heard " [3] ? What statement have we in any of the four Evangels that warrants the assertion that these women either could not or did not give a plain, truthful account of what they had seen and heard ? Has the fierce searchlight which criticism and scepticism have been pouring upon these accounts for generations past succeeded in discovering the smallest hint that these witnesses, or any of them, could not see and hear what they testified they had seen and heard, or that, having seen and heard, they failed in the telling of it ?

[1] H. B. Swete, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, p. 4.

[2] See above, ch. ix, *Other Women at the Tomb*.

[3] H. B. Swete, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*, p. 12.

Were the women who told the Apostles that they had seen a vision of angels, unable to recognize the appearance of two superhuman beings? Were they fabricating an untruth when they communicated the vision to the Apostles? Was Cleopas exaggerating or falsifying when he related their testimony to the Lord? Is there the smallest reason to believe that S. Luke has not given us a true accurate report of the words of Cleopas? And if the Sacred Scriptures give us no hint of any tripping on the part of any of these witnesses, no more does common sense allow us to accept the dictum of the critic, that these were persons little qualified to observe or recount what came before them. On the contrary, those versed in the law and experienced in the sifting of evidence unite in testifying to the superiority of the evidence given by those in the humbler walks of life. These witnesses, experts tell us, from their habits of life are quicker to observe and more retentive in perceiving the things which pass around them, and far less liable than the more cultured class to bias in favour of one side or the other. And this is pre-eminently the case with these women of Galilee who noted and related every detail that occurred at the tomb.[1] The Evangelists say nothing about that haste or excitement before and during their visit to the tomb on which critics lay so much stress; nor had any of those who beheld the Lord or His angels any pre-conceived expectation of His Resurrection from the dead.

[1] Gilbert West's observations here are well worth noting. *Observations on the Resurrection*, § xiii, pp. 72–80.

Bearing all this in mind, therefore, How can those teachers be excused who are perpetually hinting at supposed mistakes and inconsistencies in the Resurrection History? In plain language, Are they not all, wittingly or unwittingly, lending their aid to discredit the testimony of Christ's own witnesses to His Resurrection? And does it never occur to these teachers that the discrepancies which they themselves fabricate must sooner or later become a strong support to those who are bent on denying the miracle of the Resurrection?

2. Another lesson forced upon our attention by this survey is, That the Christian who would become wise unto salvation must before all things employ himself in the study of the inspired Word. This may appear a commonplace, but in the growing disuse if not contempt of the letter of the Word,[1] it is a commonplace that cannot be too often or too emphatically pressed home. The words of the Bible and the investigation of the meaning of those words appear to be the last things thought of by the preachers or by the religious writers of to-day. And yet the " Learn of me " is a continual reminder that He who is the Saviour is at the same time the Teacher of all who put their trust in Him. This is a truth too much neglected in the present day. In the pulpit as in the pew, an undiscerning craze for a " wisdom of words", together with a no less unreasoning indifference to the purity of the faith,

[1] Compare Coleridge's fine sentence :—" The letter without the spirit killeth ; but does it follow, that the spirit is to kill the letter? To kill that which it is its appropriate office to enliven? "—S. T. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection* (seventh ed., Moxon), *Aphorisms on Spiritual Religion*, VI, *com.*, p. 113.

increasingly combine to silence the "still small voice" that alone can arouse the slumberer, or whisper peace to the broken and contrite heart.

One incident in this Resurrection morning will serve not only to define my meaning but also to emphasize the importance of this lesson. When the sound of her name woke Mary Magdalene to the recognition of the Lord, seemingly about to throw herself at the feet of Jesus and clasp them as did the other women a little later, she is suddenly arrested by the words of Christ: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended unto the Father."[1] Here the English reader will note (as I have already pointed out) that the Revisers, not improbably at the suggestion of Dr. Westcott, have attached in the margin to "Touch me not" the alternative words, "Take not hold on me". On this wholly imaginary Scripture Dr. Westcott, in his Commentary on S. John, has given as a paraphrase what he supposes our Lord intended and Mary understood by the words "Take not hold on me", which, as I venture to think, the Bishop has put into our Lord's mouth instead of the words actually uttered by Him.

Another Bishop (the late Dr. Ryle of Liverpool), states the reasons why this change may be made: "The Greek word we render 'touch,' according to Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, frequently means 'fasten oneself to, cling to, hang on by, lay hold of, or grasp.' Homer frequently uses the word in this sense. This deserves special notice. Schleusner and Parkhurst agree with Liddell and Scott."[2]

[1] John xx. 17, R.V. Cp. above, ch. viii, p. 128f.
[2] *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, in loc.*

But is not Bishop Ryle here appealing to the language of the classics rather than of the New Testament? And does not Bishop Westcott's conclusion rest on the same foundation? We have the Greek word for touch (ἅπτομαι, *haptomai*) occurring, as I have pointed out in Chapter VIII, no fewer than thirty-six, or possibly thirty-seven, times in the New Testament. Everywhere our translators render it by *touch;* and although the Revisers in one passage (Col. ii. 21) change "touch" into "handle", yet even this affords no warrant for rendering Christ's words, "Take not hold on me"; nor could either of these bishops have so mistranslated this word had they allowed, as they ought to have done, its constant use in the New Testament to prevail over its earlier use in Greek classic literature. The real explanation, however, of so grave a mistranslation is the fact that Biblical scholars dislike the reason given by our Lord for the prohibition, "For I am not yet ascended to the Father"; since this prohibition to Mary, compared with the permission given to the other women to clasp the Lord's feet, is a plain intimation that the Lord was actually ascending to the Father when He presented Himself before Mary, and had returned from heaven when He presented Himself to the other women. Such an opinion our divines and expositors, with a few exceptions, conceive to be opposed to the idea which they imagine to be Scripture, that the Lord did not ascend until forty days after His Resurrection. They prefer to translate the Greek word for "touch" by a word absolutely foreign to its meaning in the New Testament

(though it involves them in a hopeless difficulty as to the reason Christ gives for the prohibition) rather than take and teach the Scripture in its plain and natural sense.

To the unlettered reader, even though he may not understand its full meaning, the reason given by Christ is plainly evident: The Lord, in His resurrection body was on His way from the grave to the presence of the Father. He tarries or turns aside for the strength and comfort of Mary Magdalene for whom, before this, He had wrought a great deliverance. At the first indication of an attempt to touch the newly-risen body, the Lord prevents her with the simple words: "Touch me not", graciously vouchsafing in addition the reason: "For I am not yet ascended unto the Father." No human hand, no touch of mortal stained by sin must be laid upon the sinless Risen One until He, the sheaf of the firstfruits (Lev. xxiii. 11), the meal offering without leaven (Lev. ii. 4, 5, 11, R.V.), has passed from the earthly grave to the Throne of the Majesty on High. How simple and natural this plain sense of ordinary words, and yet how hard to shake off the uncouth and mystifying signification with which human ingenuity has for generations past been clouding the natural and intelligible language of the Lord. Who—Mary or any one else—is capable of discovering beneath these plain and simple words such a recondite sense as that which Bishop Westcott would have us think that Mary believed and that we are to receive:—"There is yet something beyond the outward restoration to earth which must be realised, before that fellowship

towards which you reach can be established as abiding." [1] ? Did the Galilæan peasant, then, does any simple Christian now, suspect for one moment that such a marvellous conception lies conccaled under these three simple words ? When the Saviour touched the blind man's eyes, the hand of the palsied, the bier of the widow's son, or when the woman behind Him touched the tassel of Christ's robe, who has any misgivings as to the meaning of the historian's words ? Who dreams of changing "touch not" into "detain not" that he may evoke more easily some marvellous and mysterious sense of which Christ has told us nothing ? And why should we deal differently with the words before us ? Why attempt to turn into a hidden mystery a plain direction as intelligible to the Galilæan woman who received it as it ought to be to every humble Christian who reads it ? [2]

And this, again, leads me to another Scripture, linked by our Lord with this "Touch me not", of which Christ's disciple must learn the true meaning, not from commentators or commentaries, but from his own diligent and prayerful study of the Word of God. Go tell My brethren, our Lord further commands Mary. To whom does our Lord point by the words, "My brethren" ? In vain will the reader turn to the pages of every expositor

[1] *The Gospel Acc. to S. John*, xx. 17.

[2] "We bring with us a number of stereotyped ideas, which we have received as absolutely certain, and never think of testing, but only seek to confirm. And yet, could we but fearlessly and impartially investigate, we might find that some of these ideas are not in the Bible at all, while others are plainly contradicted by it."—G. H. Pember, *Earth's Earliest Ages*, p. 8.

to find an answer to this question. Few touch on it at all; and these few, only to express the opinion that it is a warmer title for the more usual "disciple" or "Apostle". One [1] only that I can just now recall to mind thinks it worth his while to suggest that it is probable that they are the Lord's own brethren after the flesh, His mother's children, to whom He now sends this message. And yet it is absolutely necessary that we assure our minds on this point if we would escape perplexity and difficulty in studying the Gospel history.

Why should we think that "brethren" here can possibly mean "disciples"? Change the word, as we may do legitimately, from the conventional "brethren" to the everyday and familiar "brothers", and at once we are sensible of a mighty change in this inspiring message:—"Go unto my brothers, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." Neither the angel who appeared to the first group of women, nor the two who invited the second group to inspect the tomb, make use of this term at all. It is Christ alone who adopts it. Remember that before Christ's Ascension there is no instance of any use of the word brethren as a designation for members of the Christian community; and even when we do find it, as in the Acts and in the Epistles, the term is rather used as indicating the common tie between all believers in Christ, as children of our Father which is in heaven, than as pointing out a relationship to Christ Himself, as in the command

[1] Hess, in Stier, *The Words of the Lord Jesus* (Clark's *F.T.L.*), vol. viii, p. 80, note.

before us, Go tell My brethren—My brethren; not, *the* brethren.

It will be remembered that S. John is careful to point out that these brothers of our Lord, His mother's children, as most modern commentators are beginning to see,[1] were not believers in Christ a few months before His death.[2] And yet, immediately after His Resurrection they are seen consorting with the disciples in Jerusalem, in "the upper chamber"[3]. How natural, how thoroughly consistent with the perfection of His human nature, this care of our Lord for His brothers after the flesh. On this, His first appearance after His Resurrection, His first thought is of them; his first message, to them. He delays His approach to the Father until He had sent by His chosen messenger the quickening word which should kindle into a flame their still slumbering faith and love. Arrived in the Father's presence, He hastens back to earth, to let them know by yet another message that the tie of human brotherhood is still unbroken. In the old home in Galilee they shall again see the Brother who

[1] See above, p. 130 ff.

I may add here the very decided opinion of Dean Farrar: "The inference, whether correct or not, to which the language of the Evangelists would naturally lead us, certainly is that 'the Lord's brothers' were the children of Joseph and Mary, born in holy wedlock after the birth of Christ. Can any one honestly say that such is not, at least, the *primâ facie* conclusion which every reader would draw from the Gospel allusions and the Gospel narrative?"

Such, he adds, is the view "accepted by Neander, Blom, Meyer, Stier, Alford, Schaff, etc."—*The Early Days of Christianity*, vol. 1, pp. 495, and 506, note.

[2] John vii. 5. [3] Acts i. 13, 15, R.V.

has become the Firstborn from the dead and ascended into the Father's Presence.

How gracious, too, the revelation of that mighty power, that Divine Majesty, to which these brothers had been so long blinded: Tell them, "I am ascending unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." To these as to no others would the truth be peculiar and significant, "My Father and your Father", "My God and your God". Hitherto they had recognized but an earthly parentage; henceforth, though still the Brother, the son of their common mother, they are to recognize a higher brotherhood, the God and Father of Jesus Christ, their God and Father too, in and through their exalted Brother.

And yet another message is sent to them. Mary has departed to bring the disciples word of Him whom she has seen and of the words she had heard. And now another company of women are departing from the tomb, to them also Jesus shows Himself, having apparently in the meantime ascended from and returned to earth again. For them also He has another message, and this, for "My brethren" likewise:—"Go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me."

Here again we may ask, Why are we to take it for granted that the word "brethren" is used by the Lord to designate the Apostles, or the disciples generally, and not His brothers after the flesh, His mother's children? Surely the question, What is the sense of the inspired Scripture? ought to be definitely answered before expositors enter upon disquisitions concerning the disciples to whom the

message was sent or the object for which the Lord gave the charge; or, concerning supposed errors and confusions into which the recording Evangelists have fallen. How much more easy and natural is it to take the word as signifying our Lord's own brothers. So taken, there appear a certain distinctness and suitability in the words addressed by the several speakers on separate occasions and to different persons. One angel recalls the words of Jesus spoken three nights before, and directs the women to tell them to the disciples and Peter. Again, two angels revive the drooping faith of other women by a reminiscence of the prediction uttered by the Lord in Galilee touching His Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection; but to these women these angels give no command. Then the Lord manifests Himself; first, to Mary Magdalene, and shortly after, to this latter group of women; and sends by both a message to His brothers. By Mary, a message to set right their perceptions regarding the spiritual brotherhood, without disowning or annulling the natural brotherhood entailed by His humanity. The message sent by women being calculated to awaken hopes and desires of higher blessings in the near prospect of their meeting in their Galilæan home. In all this there may, of course, be difference of opinion. I only contend for the importance of giving full and fair study to the letter of the inspired Word before the differing or conflicting interpretations of Scripture be adopted as substitutes for the Scripture itself.

3. And yet a third and last lesson comes to us from the history we have just closed—That the laity

no less than the clergy must make the Bible their own. Too long this duty has been tacitly relegated to the clergy or theologians, to whom, as to a Biblical oligarchy, the laity have been content to surrender their divine right of searching the Scriptures for themselves. Not always, indeed, from indolence or thoughtlessness, but from a false humility which forbids them to intrude into a domain where, as they wrongly think, the theologian has a prescriptive right to range.[1] Now the sooner such a false and unscriptural modesty is got rid of the better—better for the individual, better for the Church at large, better for the Bible itself. Do Christians ever ask themselves why the Gospel story has come to them in such simple, not to say childlike, language ; why the Lord Himself, though teaching with authority and power, speaks with the homely tongue of the peasant and not with the technicalities of the schools, and clothes His lessons of profoundest wisdom and highest truth, not in the language of the philosopher or the rhetorician, but in the speech of the market-place, the workshop, the farm ? Why all this, if not to remind His followers that Christ, the Saviour of men, Himself a man, came to speak with each individual soul, in a tongue which he might understand, the wonderful works of God ? [2]

[1] " The thought that priests and deacons as such are more capable of understanding Scripture than laymen, is absolutely alien to Origen. On the contrary, he states openly that laymen could often be better exegetes than the clergy, who often enough had the veil drawn before their eyes."—A. Harnack, *Bible Reading in the Early Church*, p. 71.

[2] In contrast to this it is to be noted this simplicity of style

The history which we have just concluded evidences this in a remarkable degree. From the taking down of the sacred body from the cross to the last view of the empty tomb beheld by S. Peter, there is not a word in the fourfold narrative not easily intelligible by the youngest child. Nothing strikes one more forcibly in reading it than the absolute ease and simplicity which pervade the whole —except perhaps the amazing ingenuity displayed by commentators in creating difficulties where really none exist. I would be the last to make light of the help which the wisdom and learning of scholars have lent to students of the Bible. The list of authorities appended to this little essay sufficiently shows the value I set upon the contributions of all who labour in this sacred tillage. And yet the fact remains, how little light has been cast here upon this portion of the Gospel history by human interpreters which may not be gathered by any ordinary English reader through the prayerful, persevering, and patient study of the two English translations of the four inspired Histories of the Resurrection morning. If we except the light shed upon the visit of the Apostles Peter and John to the tomb by the wonderfully illuminating chapter of

and language in the Scriptures was objected to by pagans and educated Christians in the early Church :—"It is, however, very noteworthy that Celsus took offence at the poor form and the inferior style of the Holy Scriptures such as were fit only for the uneducated and barbarians, and that he makes invidious comparisons with the writings of Plato. We shall see that this aspect of the Holy Scriptures presented difficulties to the Fathers, seeing that educated Christians also took offence at it."—A. Harnack, *Bible Reading in the Early Church*, p. 45.

Professor Latham [1] upon the meaning of the word which he translates "twirled", applied to the napkin which had been wound about the head of the Lord, there is nothing, I repeat it, which the untutored reader may not attain by his own unassisted labours as to the facts and truth of this Resurrection history. I even go further, and assert that the English reader thus searching out the truth for himself from the Bible which contains it, will escape many of the snares and pitfalls, the errors and confusions, into which one commentator leads another, and into which all who follow these commentators instead of their Bibles are sure to fall.[2]

The Bereean attitude must be not only the characteristic of a Christian congregation, but ever the crucial test of a successful ministry:—"They received the word with all readiness of mind." Yes, but this was not enough; they were not content to sit and listen, to admire and applaud, then to go away and forget; but, we are further told:—"examining the scriptures daily, whether these things were so. Many of them therefore believed." [3] The truly quickened soul is not content to rest its faith merely on the word of the ambassador, though that ambassador be the Apostle Paul himself. His credentials must be produced and tested, the substance and

[1] *The Risen Master*, ch. ii.

[2] "It is wonderful what an objection most men have to taking the trouble of forming opinions for themselves, and how eagerly they accept any authority that will dictate to them what views they ought to hold."—George Salmon, *The Human Element in the Gospels*, p. 2.

[3] Acts xvii. 11, 12, R.V.

condition of his proclamation diligently compared with the Sovereign's own letter. No lesser labour will suffice when a boon so precious and inestimable is at stake.

What I ask of the devout but unlettered laymen is; not a familiarity with the original tongues in which the Sacred Scriptures were first given to us, nor yet even an acquaintance with any of the many commentaries which have cast their light upon that Word; but simply this, a patient attention to the Sacred Words as they are brought before our eyes in the two versions of our English Bible, an earnest effort on the part of the reader to ascertain what it is exactly that these words say. I plead with the untutored reader who holds these versions to be a close and faithful translation of that which was spoken or written by the inspiration of God that he would expend his whole attention and effort in the earnest endeavour to ascertain what God had intended to be conveyed by His words. If Christian people would but do this, what new light, what fresh interest, would they experience in the simple perusal of their Bibles, in the reading of the Old and New Testaments alike.

It has been recently stated that in regard to the Bible "The question now more to the front than any other is simply whether, in fact, the statements found in the Bible are ordinarily true." [1] There is, however, I venture to think, yet another question, which must take precedence even of this. It is the question, *What are these statements?* The preceding chapters contain ample proof that popular

[1] W. J. Beecher, *Reasonable Biblical Criticism*, p. 14.

criticism is perpetually accepting as Scripture what in fact is no Scripture. To make my meaning clearer let me here add one or two more to the examples already given.

Every one is familiar with the quotation "That he who runs may read", and there are few who are not fully persuaded that in using it they are citing Scripture itself. Preachers and expositors have not failed to apply the lesson, That the sacred revelation has been made so plain as to leave no excuse even to the most hurried and anxious wayfarer for neglecting it. From old Matthew Henry down to the *Speaker's Commentary* this inference will be found to be drawn: "That every one may read it fluently; or, may seize its import at once in whatever haste he may be", so comments the *Speaker*[1]!

Yet the words of Scripture afford no ground for such an inference: "Write" says the Lord to the prophet "that he may run that readeth it." As the Jewish Targum expounds it in its proper sense: "Write the prophecy, and explain it in the book of the law, that he may hasten to obtain wisdom, whoever he is that reads in it." The reader has only to open his Bible at this prophecy to see how the popular misquotation utterly destroys the force and meaning of the Divine injunction. The prophet's vision was to be written and promulgated, not for the sake of some fugitive who, fleeing from death or destruction, might look and read it; but—wholly different—in order that the reader, whoever he might be, should be inspired by the glory of the

[1] On Hab. ii. 2.

vision to press on in the sure hope of participating in it.[1]

Now what I would press on my reader is this: Whoever he may be—young preacher, Sunday school teacher, unlettered cottager—let him not be perverted in his judgement by the piety of *Matthew Henry* or the learning of *The Speaker*, against his common sense, which tells him that "That he who runs may read" is not nor can be the same as "That he who reads may run". And when he finds that the Revisers have preserved the latter rendering, which is the rendering of the Authorized Version, he is justified in maintaining his independence in the face of any commentator, no matter how great the name of that commentator, who attempts to persuade him that Scripture says what he knows it does not say.

Let us take another example, a not uncommon one. How many a young preacher, face to face with his Christmas Day sermon, has been so captivated by the words, "Dear Desire of every nation" in Wesley's hymn, as to deliver his message from the Prophet Haggai's words in the English Bible, "The Desire of all nations shall come", thinking this a fitting text on which to base the Christmas message for his flock. The expectation, the One Desired, His coming, are easy natural divisions under

[1] Could S. Paul have had this prophecy in his mind when, with reference to the resurrection of the saints, he declared to the Philippians (Phil. iii. 14), "I press on toward the goal", etc.? It is remarkable that his word for *press on*, διώκω (*diōkō*), is the same as that used in the Greek Translation of the Old Testament for the prophet's word *run*.

which the text is often treated. But however eloquent and forcible the sermon may be, one thing is certain, it is not God's message which is delivered. Had the preacher but compared his Revised with the Authorized Version, he would have found, perhaps somewhat to his astonishment, "the desire of all nations" converted into "desirable things". Had he taken down his Septuagint, the translation of the Old Testament Scriptures into Greek made by Jews more than a hundred years before the birth of Christ, he would have discovered that these Jews, who surely must have understood their own language, render the passage in the plural: "desirable things", "choice portions", τα εκλεκτὰ (*ta eklekta*), Hag. ii. 7, LXX. Then, consulting the context, he would have found that in place of the lowliness and obscurity attaching to the coming upon which he had discoursed, the prophet is indicating the manifestation of the Messiah's triumphant glory. And lastly, had he consulted Archdeacon Perowne's short but most scholarly commentary on Haggai in *The Cambridge Bible* series, he would have been convinced of the impossibility of delivering his discourse and at the same time esteeming himself a faithful exponent of the revealed will of God.

Here then we have an illustration of the danger, ever present to preachers of the Word, of omitting to inquire in the very first instance what it is that any passage of Scripture under consideration exactly says. And if this caution be neglected by the preacher, how important for the layman to be able to note and correct from his own knowledge of the

Bible any error which may be, and not infrequently is, transmitted from the pulpit. To do this, it is not necessary that he should have a knowledge of Greek or be possessed of a library of Commentaries, it is sufficient for him as he reads his daily portion of the Sacred Scriptures, to put the one question at every doubtful passage which meets him, Have I considered, am I sure what their Divine Author means to say in using these words before me? What exactly do they say? If the doubt still remains, then let him compare the Revised Version, and if that gives no clearer light, let him note the passage as one to be talked over with his clergyman or some scholarly friend who may be better able to elucidate the point, until at last he is convinced that he has grasped the meaning which the words were intended to convey. Weeks or months, perhaps even years, may pass before his mind is satisfied that he rightly comprehends the words in question; but even so, it is more reverent, as it is more profitable, to wait for this right understanding than impatiently to place upon the sacred words a sense of one's own which God never intended them to convey.

In such study as this the devout layman will not only increase his own spiritual comfort by a closer application to the words of the Sacred Scriptures; his outlook will indeed be widened, his faith in the promises deepened and strengthened, his affection and veneration for the Book as God's very message to man confirmed, so that he can say with the Psalmist, "I opened wide my mouth, and panted; For I longed for thy commandments"[1]; but this

[1] Ps. cxix. 131, R.V.

very thirst for the Word of God will have an influence reaching far beyond himself. This panting after the knowledge of God's Word on the part of those who hear, cannot fail to affect the utterance of him who preaches: "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." [1] Sooner or later the preacher must awake to the conviction that the Word of God is the paramount desire of the Church, and forthwith prepare himself with all diligence to satisfy that desire. It can hardly be said that this is at present the first concern of the modern preacher; for it is the universal complaint that little by little the proclamation of Law and Gospel alike is assuredly disappearing: "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed." Every conceivable topic is dealt with: the politics of the day, the question of the hour, the social problem, the last discovery of science, these, or some of these subjects fill the sermons of to-day; but how rarely is the Sacred Word unfolded, explained, enforced, that the message of God to man

[1] Mal. ii. 7. "Every one is *to give a reason of his faith*; but priests and ministers more punctually than any, their province being to make good every sentence of the Bible to a rational inquirer into the truth of these oracles. Enthusiasts find it an easy thing to heat the fancies of unlearned and unreflecting hearers; but when a sober man would be satisfied of the grounds from whence they speak, he shall not have one syllable or the least tittle of a pertinent answer. Only they will talk big of the Spirit, and inveigh against reason with bitter reproaches, calling it carnal or fleshly, though it be indeed no soft flesh, but enduring and penetrant steel, even the sword of the Spirit, and such as pierces to the heart."—S. T. Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection* (seventh ed., Moxon), *Aphorisms on Spiritual Religion*, 1, p. 108.

be implanted in the minds of those who come to receive it. Surely it is time for the Church of Christ to awake from her lethargy, to remember that there is a life to come for which the life here is the preparation, and to search those Scriptures wherein we think we have eternal life, reverencing the words of their Divine Author, "AND THESE ARE THEY WHICH BEAR WITNESS OF ME."[1]

[1] John v. 39, R.V.

LIST OF AUTHORS REFERRED TO

Alford, Dean H., *The Greek Testament.*
Allen, Archd. W. C., *Gospel according to S. Matthew* (*Internat. Crit. Comm.*).

Bartlet, Prof. J. V., In Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Beecher, Prof. W. J., *Reasonable Biblical Criticism.*
Bengel, J. A., *Gnomon of the New Testament.*
Blass, Prof. F., *Philology of the Gospels.*
Burgon, Dean J. B., *The Revision Revised.*
,, ,, ,, *The Last Twelve Verses of S. Mark.*

Coleridge, S. T., *Aids to Reflection* (seventh edition : Moxon).
Cook, Canon F. C., In *Speaker's Commentary.*

Edersheim, Dr. A., *The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah.*
Ellicott, Bp. C. J., *S. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*
,, ,, ,, *S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.*
,, ,, ,, *S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.*
,, ,, ,, *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ.*
Evans, Canon, In *Speaker's Commentary.*

Farrar, Canon F. W., *The Life and Work of S. Paul.*
,, ,, ,. *The Early Days of Christianity.*

Gore, Bp. C., *The Body of Christ.*

Harnack, Prof. A., *Bible Reading in the Early Church.*
Holland, Prof., H. S., In *Miracles.*
Horsley, Bp. S., *Sermons on the Resurrection.*

Lake, Prof. Kirsopp, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.*
Lange, Prof. J. P., *Commentary on the New Testament* (Schaff's edition).
Latham, Rev. H., *The Risen Master.*
Lightfoot, Bp. J. B., *Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion.*

Mayor, Rev. J. B., *Commentary of the Epistle of S. James.*
Meyer, Dr. H. A. W., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Eng. tr.: T. & T. Clark).
Milligan, Prof. W., *The Resurrection of our Lord.*

Orr, Prof. J., *The Resurrection of Jesus.*

Peake, Dr. A. S., *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.*
Pearson, Bp. J., *An Exposition of the Creed* (Sinker's edition).
Pember, G. H., *Earth's Earliest Ages.*
Perowne, Bp. J. J. S., *Haggai and Zechariah* (*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*).
Pullan, Rev. Leighton, In Murray's *Bible Dictionary.*

Ramsay, Sir W. M., In Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Reynolds, Preb. B., In Murray's *Bible Dictionary.*
Robinson, Rev. C. H., *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ.*
Robinson, Dean J. Armitage, *The Study of the Gospels.*
Ryle, Bp. J. C., *Expository Thoughts on the Gospels.*

Salmon, Dr. G. A., *The Human Element in the Gospels.*
,, ,, ,, *An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* (ninth edition).
Schaff, Dr. P., In Lange's *Commentary on the New Testament.*
Schürer, Prof. E., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Clark's *F.T.L.*).
Simpson, Dr. W. J. Sparrow, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought.*
Steinmeyer, Prof. F. L., *The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord* (Clark's *F.T.L.*).
Stier, Dr. R., *The Words of the Lord Jesus* (Clark's *F.T.L.*).
Streeter, Rev. B. H., In *Foundations.*
Swete, Prof. H. B., *The Gospel according to S. Mark.*
,, ,, ,, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion.*
,, ,, ,, *The Ascended Christ.*
,, ,, ,, *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of S. Peter* (tr.).

Thirlwall, Bp. C., *Essays, Speeches and Sermons.*
Thomas, Dr. W. H. Griffith, In *The Record, May* 31, 1912.
Thompson, Rev. J. M., *Miracles in the New Testament.*
,, ,, ,, In *The Guardian, Nov.* 10, 1911.
Townson, Archd. T., *Discourses on the Four Gospels.*

Wace, Dean H., In *The Record, Dec.* 13, 1912.
West, Gilbert, *Observations on the History and Evidences of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ** (In *The Evidences of The Christian Religion* : 5 vols.).
Westcott, Bp. B. F., *The Gospel according to S. John.*
,, ,, ,, *The Gospel of the Resurrection.*
Wieseler, Karl, *A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (tr. by Rev. E. Venables).
Winer, Dr. G. B., *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Moulton's edition).

Vogan, Dr. T. S. L., *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist.*

* A reprint of this valuable old book is much to be desired. Why does not the *R. T.S.*, which has so ably edited and reprinted Lord Lyttelton's *The Conversion of S. Paul,* perform a similar kind office for this book by his friend West ?

INDEX

Alford, Dean H. : 34, 47, 68, 161.
Allen, Archd. W. C. : 101.
" And behold " : frequent use of by S. Matt., 109, 162ff.
Andrew, the brother of Peter : 50.
Angel : 142, 156 ; young man or, 54ff., 56ff., 89–90, 112ff. ; message of, 114–7, 121, 144f., 156, 166.
Angel of the Lord : 200.
Annas, the High Priest : 79ff.
Ascension, The : 130, 172, 192 ; on R. Day, 128f., 217–9 ; forty days after R., 199–201, 203f.

Barnabas : 57.
Bengel, J. A. : 46, 74.
Beza : and Codex D., 178.
Bible : neglect of, 10, 24, 215, 224.
Body, the Lord's : identity of pre and post R., 23–4, 201ff. ; entombment of, 90, 92 ; Risen, 192ff. ; uniqueness of, 193 ; twofold nature of, 196ff., 200–1.
" Brothers, My " : not Apostles, 130ff., 220f. ; best witnesses to the R. Body, 173 ; first message to, 156, 166, 186, 219–22 ; second message to, 155, 156, 166, 187, 222f.
Burgon, Dean J. B. : on " The loud cry ", 69.

Cæsar, Julius : and the *publicani*, 96.
Caiaphas : 79, 81.
Centurion, The : his testimony to the Lord's death, 68f., 77.
Cleopas : on the road to Emmaus, 147–9, 178, 184 ; incidental evidence of, 143–4, 160–1, 167–8, 180, 214.
Clopas : 74.
Comforter, The : promise of, 39f.
Cooke, Canon F. C. : 93, 161.
Crucifixion, The : Apostles present at, 37f., 66ff., 71ff.
" Cry, The loud " : the first, 65–7 ; the last, 67–70, 74, 96–7 ; Revisers' blunder, 69f.

"Desire of all nations": 229f.
διψῶ: 70–3.

Ellicott, Bp. C. J.: 9, 157ff., 205.
Evangelists: sole authority for the R., 5ff., 27; independence of each, 32ff.; record the incidents of our Lord's death, 64–74; trustworthiness of, 49ff., 61f.; and critics, 83ff.

"Flesh and blood": Hebrew circumlocution for man, 204–7.

Gore, Bp. C.: 197.
Gospel of S. Peter: 103.
Gospels: effect of Synoptic Problem, 6, 44ff., 53ff.; weakness of Christian apologists for, 24f., 52f.; order of, 34; authors of, 35ff.; origin of, 41ff.; historicity of, 41ff.; earliest narrative of the R., 98ff.
Grave-clothes: disposition of, 122ff.
Guard at the Tomb, The: 59f., 75, 93–7, 105f., 108–10.

Henry, Matthew: 228.
Herod: 50, 83.
"He who runs may read": 228–9.
Hort, Dr. F. J. A.: 70.

James and Joses: 75.
James, brother of John: 51.
James, the Lord's brother: 28, 173–5.
Jesus: appears to S. Paul, 29f., 32: "sayings" of, 43, 52; fulfils prophecy, 73; attended to the cross, 106; appears to women, 111, 147–9, 155, 160–1, 167–8, 187, 194; appears to Mary M., 128, 151, 186, 194, 216; Risen, 166ff.
Joanna: 91, 93, 98, 117, 141, 149f., 155, 183, 187.
John, S.: author of Gospel, 25, 34f., 58; intimate with High Priest, 38, 96; first-hand witness, 50, 70ff., 76f., 133, 174; recorded Judæan ministry, 63, 84ff., visits Tomb, 98, 121ff., 151, 180ff., 186, 187, 191; house of, 156; an informant of Matthew, 166.
Joseph of Arimathæa: 75, 77, 82ff., 87ff., 91, 107, 125, 155, 201.
Joseph, the Lord's brother: 173.
Joshua: 113.
Judas: 17, 174.
Jude, the Lord's brother: 173, 175.

κράξας: 69f., 74.

Lake, Prof. Kirsopp: 54, 89, 91, 108, 111, 126, 135, 139.
"Late on the Sabbath Day": 100f.

Latham, Rev. H.: 113, 135, 226; on the Tomb, 122ff.
"Let him that readeth understand": 46ff.
Luke, S.: 25; date of his Gospel, 34ff.; how he wrote his Gospel, 41ff., 51, 66; wrote for the Gentiles, 67f., 154; accuracy of, 83, 188; reports other women's visit to Tomb, 90ff.

Malchus: 38, 76.
Mark, S.: 25, 35f., 118, 188; priority of his Gospel not proven, 32ff., 44ff., 58, 105f., names disciples on Mt. Olives, 50; probably witnessed Crucifixion, 68–9; supposed to be "young man" (Mk. xiv. 51), 113; graphic details of, 153f.
Maries, The two: 92f., 102, 107, 141f., 155, 158.
Mary Magdalene: 75, 91ff., 139, 156ff., 172, 175, 177, 181, 188, 202; first visit to Sepulchre, 98f., 107, 110ff., 120f., 141ff., 149ff., 185; second visit to Sepulchre, 127ff., 132ff., 151, 166, 186, 194, 216.
Mary, S. Mark's mother: 50, 188.
Mary, the mother of James: 75, 91–3, 98f., 117, 149ff., 185f., 187f.
Matthew, S.: 25, 42, 51; opinion of Church on, 34ff., 94; Gospel independent of S. Mark, 101; critics and, 54ff., 59f., 61, 95f., 104f., 110, 118, 153, 166, 190f.
Meyer, Dr. H. A. W.: 46, 88.
Milligan, Prof. W.: 173.
"Myrrhed wine": 44ff.

Nicodemus: 75f., 84ff., 125, 201.

Orr, Prof. J.: 28, 159, 212.

Parkhurst: 216.
Paul, S.: and the R., 5, 18ff., 205ff.; evidence of, not co-ordinate with Apostles', 27–32.
Pearson, Bp. J.: 69, 88.
Peter, S.: 38, 42, 50f., 76, 99, 114–5, 118, 130, 156, 166, 174, 202; and the R., 18; visits the sepulchre with John, 98, 120ff., 151, 166, 186; second visit, 99, 177ff., 187; angel's message to, 115–7, 144f.; his prominence in R. narrative, 132, 183f.; guide and instructor of Mark, 188.
Pilate, Pontius: 59, 75ff., 81ff., 93, 95. 125.

Quelle: 43, 59.

Ramsay, Sir W.: 96.

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Resurrection, The: cardinal truth of religion, 17ff.; chief point of attack, 22; no witness of, 102ff., 189ff.
Revisers': Mistakes of, 69f.; 128f., 216–9; 178.
Robinson, Dean J. A.: 51f.
Robinson, Rev. C. H.: 100.
"Rolled away": 111f.
Ryle, Bp. J. C.: 216.

Salmasius: 87f.
Salmon, Dr. G. A.: 36, 60.
Salome: 93, 98f., 107, 110, 117, 141f., 151, 155ff., 165, 183.
Sanhedrin, The: critics confuse sittings of, 78ff.
Schleusner: 216.
Scott, Liddell and: 216.
"Secret cipher, The": 115–7, 144f., 166.
Simon, the Lord's brother: 173.
Simpson, Dr. W. J. Sparrow: 28, 171, 208.
Steinmeyer, Prof. F. L.: 192.
Stone: sealing of, not legendary, 93ff.
Susanna: 93.
Swete, Prof. H. B.: 8, 103, 192, 212.

Thompson, Rev. J. M.: 54, 78, 84, 106, 113.
Tomb, The: 75; nature of, 87ff., 111; empty, 99, 105ff., 120ff., 126, 132ff., 142, 166; five visits to, (1) 89, 93, 98, 99ff., 185, (2) 98, 120ff., 186, (3) 98, 127ff., 186, (4) 99, 139ff., 186-7, (5) 99, 177ff., 187.
"Touch me not": 128f., 216–19.
Townson, Archd. T.: 9, 100, 148f., 158ff.
Thomas: 195.
Tradition: Galilæan, 37, 153; Judæan, 147, 153.

Vogan, Dr. T. S. L.: 198.

Wace, Dean H.: 8.
West, Gilbert: 9, 110, 136f., 157.
Westcott, Bp. B. F.: 194, 208, 216.
Wieseler, Karl: 158.

Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., Printers, The Empire Press, Norwich.

den, R. W. H221
evangelists and the

232.5R
H221
Harden, R. W.
The evangelists and the

232.5R
H221
O